

within the drainage of the Arroyo Seco, Angeles National Forest, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 5021. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1947, so as to permit State and local taxation of property leased thereunder; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5022. A bill to provide that temporary housing projects located in municipalities may, on the request of the municipalities, be disposed of without regard to the removal provisions of existing law; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 5023. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make an allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. J. Res. 298. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the Air Force of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. Res. 432. Resolution for the relief of Georgia Reed; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. Res. 433. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a Fuel Oil Coordinator; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 5024. A bill for the relief of Crawford F. Carpenter, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON (by request):

H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Josefina Felu Mielnikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 5026. A bill for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5027. A bill for the relief of Mor Klein and Mrs. Teri Muller Klein, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5028. A bill for the relief of Five Boro Personal Loan Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1149. By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of 53 residents of California, urging that legislation establishing a system of universal military training be enacted; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1150. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of H. E. Michaels and 81 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1151. Also, petition of William C. Fische, Jr., and 60 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, urging passage of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1152. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Miss Amanda E. Lind and 11 others, in favor of

universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1153. Also, petition of Mrs. Haworth and 14 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1154. Also, petition of Mrs. Louis Clark and 105 others, in favor of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1155. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 86 residents of Butler County, urging the passage of H. J. Res. 239 and S. J. Res. 150, the Christian amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1156. Also, petition of 91 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1157. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of Charles H. Carey Post, No. 56, American Legion, Salem, Ohio, signed by 34 members, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1158. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of New Athens, Ohio, signed by 11 members, in support of the Capper bill and the Bryson bill prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation and importation of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1159. Also, petition of 15 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1160. By Mr. MCGARVEY: Petition submitted by members of the Pennsylvania Railroad Post, No. 204, the American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1161. Also, petition submitted by Miss Betty Crothers, Philadelphia, Pa., and others, in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1162. Also, petition submitted by Mrs. A. H. Wittman, Philadelphia, Pa., and others, in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1163. Also, petition submitted by members of the William P. Roche Unit, No. 21, American Legion, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1164. Also, petition submitted by members of the Breen-McCracken Unit, No. 27, American Legion Auxiliary, Philadelphia, Pa., in support of legislation to establish a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1165. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mrs. William W. Wakeman and sundry citizens of Massachusetts advocating enactment of S. 265; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1166. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition containing 87 signatures of residents of Racine County, Wis., and presented by the Racine County commander of the American Legion, in support of legislation for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1167. By the SPEAKER: Petition of student veterans of West Virginia State College petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to increase subsistence to veterans going to college; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1168. Also, petition of Local No. 22, ILGWU, of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to exporting arms and munitions of war to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1169. Also, petition of the chairman of the executive committee of the Protestant War Veterans of the United States, Inc., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to opposing the Marshall plan and aid to Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dost reveal Thyself to the pure in heart, we pray Thee to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. Allow not fears and doubt to abound. Free our hearts, and grant us wisdom and courage for these expectant days of hard work and loads to carry.

We pray for our own America, that she may always be a land of churches, homes, and schools, with a national theme of tolerance and good will to all within her borders. May her reverence, integrity, and simplicity be a royal fortress and her hearthstones be a rampart against this garish world.

Our Father, this day may we render acceptable service unto Thee. In the holy name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 19, 1948, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 369. An act for the relief of the dependents of Carl B. Sanborn;

H. R. 769. An act for the relief of the estate of Ruth Horton Hunter;

H. R. 1155. An act for the relief of the estate of W. H. Rodgers, deceased;

H. R. 1175. An act for the relief of the estate of Daphne Ward Pope, deceased;

H. R. 1319. An act for the relief of Calvin J. Frederick;

H. R. 1426. An act to extend veterans' preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen and ex-servicewomen;

H. R. 1531. An act for the relief of William P. Gillingham;

H. R. 1645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leona McMinn Winkler;

H. R. 1933. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth F. McCombie;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2348. An act for the relief of Charles J. Smith;

H. R. 2891. An act for the relief of Mattie A. Horner;

H. R. 3068. An act for the relief of Alfred Thomas Freitas;

H. R. 3146. An act to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4055. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans.

## RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignations from committees:

JANUARY 20, 1948.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN,  
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

MELVIN PRICE.

JANUARY 20, 1948.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

With kind regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

EUGENE J. KEOGH.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations will be accepted. There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 434).

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Armed Services.*

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 435).

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, That EUGENE J. KEOGH, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.*

The resolution was agreed to.

## REESTABLISHMENT OF THE GOLD STANDARD

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, on November 28 last I discussed the deterioration of our money since 1933 and pointed out that the only cure for spiraling prices appeared to be a restoration of free circulation of gold.

Today I have introduced a bill providing for the reestablishment of the gold standard on January 20, 1949—1 year from today—the date the next administration takes office.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of restoring the circulation of gold and ending the deterioration of our money is of direct and immediate importance to every bondholder, insurance-policy owner, and every pensioner in America.

However, restoring the right of the American citizen to own gold may be of much greater significance. There is impressive evidence indicating that the right to own gold is the human freedom

on which all other freedoms ultimately depend.

It appears that only by the right to own gold can the people control the public purse and thus effectively restrain their political rulers. Because of that fact, the modern tyrants of Europe, Lenin, Hitler, and Mussolini, all quickly prohibited individual ownership of gold. Then there remained in the hands of the people no effective barrier against inflation and war.

If Congress will move constructively to restore to Americans the freedom to own gold, the drive here toward the chaos of national bankruptcy and perpetual war can most surely be ended.

In the weeks ahead I expect to discuss this important subject from time to time. Meanwhile, I hope all interested in peace and economic stability will carefully consider this proposal as possibly the only real and complete way out of our present difficulties.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Hon. KARL STEFAN entitled "Glass-House Tenant."

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three statements presented as a program on synthetic rubber before the Chemical Engineers' Club.

## PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read to the House a letter which I received from a farmer in Kansas. It reads as follows:

MORRILL, KANS., January 12, 1947.

MR. ALBERT COLE,  
*House Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. COLE: You, as a Representative of the people of this district, will have the opportunity during this session of Congress to speed the return of normal government or to further shackle certain industries through Government control.

I am a small farmer in Brown County engaged in diversified farming. Hog raising has always been best suited to my farm so in the past and now most of my crops and efforts end up in about 80 head of hogs produced annually. Whether or not I make a living depends to a great extent upon how much profit I make on my hogs, not, understand, how much I get for my hogs. I have sold hogs for \$15 per hundredweight at a much larger profit than I receive today. Since we are continually bombarded with the discussion of high meat prices I think it is time the public should be informed of the real facts of the issue rather than sold on the idea of rationing and price control as Secretary Anderson is doing.

Meat is high but to my knowledge I have never produced pork at less profit than I do today. Understand I am not complaining about the situation as it is today, I am merely stating my case against rationing and

price control in an industry which is already in a seriously low state of production because of the unattractive profit outlook. With record high grain prices we must have high meat prices or no meat. Ration meat now and there'll be none to ration later.

Today on my farm I can get \$27 per hundredweight for my choice hogs; I can sell my corn for \$2.70 per bushel. It has always been an accepted fact that it requires about 10 bushels of corn to produce 100 pounds of pork. Therefore at present prices I about break even on my feed costs. I sell my corn through the hogs for just about what I could sell the corn. Here's where the rub comes in—there's a hell of a lot of work and risk in raising hogs. It's no fun caring for them when the snow is hip deep or the mud in the lots is a foot deep. Then, too, an epidemic can strike your herd and wipe out your hogs and the corn crop that is already in them. The fellow, I'd say, that's sitting by the fire and has already sold his corn is the one in the golden chair when the feeding ratio is as it is today. I'm not in the hog business for conditions as they are today but I stay because there is always the possibility of a change before the next crop of hogs go to market. I may not make any money on the hogs I am now feeding but if the Government lets things alone I am still willing to gamble with the hogs.

Price control and rationing is nothing more or less than a political move to reduce the price of meat. The administration is smart enough to know that they cannot reduce the price of grain because the grain producer can sit on his grain until hell freezes over. With livestock the situation is different, when it reaches a certain age and weight it must be marketed regardless of price. I will admit that rationing and price control of meat would be a boon to President Truman this fall because millions would think they had benefited by the lower living costs. Have they forgotten their grumblings of a year or two ago when meat was not available at any price? After all are high living costs so poisonous a situation? We had low living costs in the early thirties; we also had bread lines, relief, and unemployment.

The impending shortage of meat is due largely to one thing—the lack of visible profit in its present production. The livestock producer doesn't ask \$25, \$30, or \$35 per hundred for his product; he asks for a profit for his labor. The present price of grain makes \$30 hogs a just and fair price. If the price of meat is reduced by act of Congress then I am shooting crabs with a pair of dice that are loaded to roll deuces and I am forced to quit the game or go broke.

Sincerely,

VERN R. MOEHLMAN.

## PRICE CONTROL AND RATIONING

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a great deal of late about the return to controls and rationing. I have always been opposed to controls and rationing because I consider them absolutely contrary to the American philosophy of government. However, to implement my own thought on the subject, I would like to quote the words of Joe Stalin on the subject of rationing. He said, and I quote:

Ration books in the hands of the proletarian states are the most powerful means of



control. A power unprecedented in history, a means of compulsion stronger than the laws of the convent or of the guillotine.

We had better beware before it is too late.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from a speech made by me before the Women's Patriotic Conference in Washington, D. C., on January 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### REDUCTION IN THE COST OF LUMBER

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper release of the Joint Committee on Housing dated January 9, 1948, announcing the 10-percent reduction in the cost of lumber for 60 days by the Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of St. Paul, Minn. This is the first voluntary move by a leading lumber producer to announce a cut in prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the release from the Joint Committee on Housing is as follows:

Encouraged by the first voluntary move by a leading lumber producer to announce a cut in prices, Congressman RALPH A. GAMBLE, Republican, New York, chairman of the Joint Committee on Housing, called upon another important building-material industry to aid in attaining the objective sought by the anti-inflation law recently enacted by Congress.

In a telegram to the Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of St. Paul, Minn., and to Laird Bell, of Chicago, chairman of the board, Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., of Tacoma, Wash., which announced on Friday a 10-percent cut in lumber prices at the mill, Chairman GAMBLE complimented these companies on their moves and made it known that he had called upon the gypsum industry to pursue a similar course.

Chairman GAMBLE's telegram to the lumber firms read:

"The 10-percent cut in lumber prices at the mill which you have just announced is the first victory in our concentrated attack on inflation.

"I commend you for the courage you have shown in taking the leadership in support of the public interest.

"If other responsible interests in your great industry follow your example, we can quickly realize substantial savings in housing construction costs.

"Our committee has called the gypsum industry to a conference in Washington on January 28, similar to the one we held last Friday (January 9) for leaders in the lumber industry. I am hopeful the gypsum industry will join the lumber industry in reducing costs, speeding up production and channeling shipments to areas where materials are short, thereby promoting the objective sought by the anti-inflation law recently enacted by Congress."

The foregoing message to the Weyerhaeuser firms was prompted by a statement made by F. K. Weyerhaeuser, president, Weyerhaeuser Sales Co., in which he said:

"We wish to do our part in reducing the cost of building and in checking the inflationary trends now threatening our national

welfare. Due to the great demand for lumber arising from the wartime depletion of stocks and the postwar boom in home construction, lumber prices have risen sharply but in about the same proportion as the prices of farm products.

"While the cost of lumber used in the average small house totals only about 20 percent of the cost of all materials and lumber used, nevertheless the price of lumber affects total building costs. Since OPA controls were removed we have followed a very conservative policy in the pricing of our products right down to the present moment.

"In spite of our present price position we have determined to make price reductions on house building items of Douglas fir, western hemlock, and coast red cedar lumber shipped from our affiliated sawmills and going to the retail lumber trade. We will maintain these prices on such shipments for the next 60 days and longer if we believe conditions warrant.

"These reductions will average 10 percent of the f. o. b. mill value. They will appear in our price quotations to retail customers and will also apply to orders now on file for these customers and shipped after this date."

#### HAS THE ROOSEVELT POLICY ON GOVERNMENT SPECULATORS BEEN REVERSED BY TRUMAN?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include two letters and two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, recent disclosures have proved that high officials in the present administration have been engaging in commodity speculations.

It is interesting to note that President Franklin D. Roosevelt prohibited officers or employees from engaging in such practices when he was President. This order was issued April 22, 1937. It reads:

I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. Engagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Following this announcement of Presidential policy the following notice was sent on April 30, 1937, to the heads of all departments and independent establishments:

In a letter dated April 22, 1937, the President requested the Commission to take steps to inform all officials and employees of the Government that speculation on their part or in their behalf in corporate stocks or bonds or in commodities is contrary to Government policy. The President said:

"I believe it to be a sound policy of the Government that no officer or employee shall participate directly or indirectly in any transaction concerning the purchase or sale of corporate stocks or bonds or of commodities for speculative purposes, as distinguished from bona fide investment purposes. En-

gagement in such speculative activities by any officer or employee, whether under the competitive civil service or not, should be among the matters considered by the heads of departments and establishments and by the Commission in passing upon questions concerning his qualifications for retention or advancement."

Accordingly, an official notice to this effect should be distributed to each officer under your jurisdiction, whether under the competitive civil service or not, for the information and guidance of the officials and employees therein.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,

President.

The appointments of Edwin W. Pauley to the several offices he has recently held in the administration were in violation of this policy. These appointments indicate that the Truman administration is not following the same policy in such matters as was followed during the Roosevelt administration, even though President Truman, Attorney General Clark, and Secretary of Agriculture Anderson have made a number of recent speeches denouncing commodity speculators.

Now that these individuals have been charged with violating this policy, and the initial evidence has supported the charges, what standard is to be applied in proving them? Raymond Moley, who was an early supporter of President Roosevelt, has unearthed a Roosevelt precedent to cover the case. He states that where the initial evidence supports a violation of public trust by a public official the traditional rule as to the burden of proof is reversed and the burden rests with the officer charged. Moley states:

Members of this administration cannot sit tight and demand that Stassen and others prove them guilty. It is up to them to prove their innocence.

The entire article is here inserted under leave to extend my remarks:

MOLEY SAYS ADMINISTRATION MUST STICK TO F. R. STANDARD

In February 1932, as governor, Franklin D. Roosevelt removed Thomas M. Farley, sheriff of New York County. In doing so, he brushed aside several charges filed with him and rested his action on a broad principle of public morality.

Farley's bank account bulged with funds for which no explanation had been made. Nor had it been proved that these funds were illegally accumulated.

But since Farley held an office of public trust, Roosevelt maintained that the traditional rule that the burden of proof rested with the accuser was reversed and that the burden in such a case rested with the official charged. This reporter was in a position to know that Roosevelt, in making this point, was trying to set a standard for all future office holding.

In announcing his decision, he said: "The stewardship of public officers is a serious and sacred trust. They are so close to the means for private gain that in a sense not at all true of private citizens, their personal possessions are invested with a public importance in the event that their stewardship is questioned.

"One of their deep obligations is to recognize this, not reluctantly or with resistance, but freely. It is in the true spirit of a public trust to give, when personally called upon, public proof of the nature, source, and extent of their financial affairs.

"It is true that this is not always pleasant. But standards of public service must be measured in this way . . . because if popular government is to continue to exist it must in such matters hold its stewards to a stern and uncompromising rectitude."

The present members of the Truman administration hold office because the people elected the man who announced this principle. Their responsibilities as well as their power are derived from his mandate.

Members of this administration cannot under this principle sit tight and demand that Stassen and others prove them guilty. It is up to them to prove their innocence.

RAYMOND MOLEY.

Also here included under leave to extend my remarks is editorial appearing in the Minneapolis Star of January 14, 1948:

#### SMELLS BAD, MR. TRUMAN

Ed Pauley, special assistant to the Secretary of the Army, didn't make a million dollars speculating in the commodities market, Mr. Stassen. How could you accuse him of such a thing? He profited by only \$932,703.10, he says.

And Brig. Gen. Wallace Graham, White House physician, didn't deal in commodities after President Truman denounced speculators last October. At least, he didn't mean to. He still played the market in cotton and cottonseed oil, but he didn't think they were commodities. And he didn't incur a loss, as he said earlier. Now he admits he made \$6,165.25.

After trying to create the impression for months that he didn't know a broker from a billygoat, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma now confesses that he did do a little speculating, in his wife's name, to eke out his meager salary.

Trading on the commodity markets isn't illegal. It's a legitimate part of the milling and grain and similar businesses. But gambling on a rise or fall in prices in these days of world-wide want has a bad smell. Particularly when the gamblers are Government insiders who are in a position to know in advance about decisions which affect the market.

Mr. Truman has done a lot of talking about the evils of speculation. Much of it hasn't made complete sense. But now offenders are found right in his own circle.

What are you going to do about it, Mr. President?

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wish to urge the passage of my bill presently pending before the Judiciary Committee, prohibiting speculation in commodities by certain officers and employees of the Government.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the proposed St. Lawrence seaway.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles, one from this week's issue of Newsweek and one from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Litchfield County Farm Bureau, of Connecticut, at their annual meeting on January 9, 1948.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and that the same appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### SHIPMENTS OF FUEL OIL ABROAD

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, under a Paris date line, January 17, the Associated Press dispatch discloses that Ambassador Caffery stated that in the first 24 days of the interim-aid shipments of coal to France amounted to 1,250,000 tons, plus 200,000 tons of petroleum. I would suggest to some of those on the east coast bothered with fuel shortages that, while it may not get them needed fuel, they can at least generate some warmth, get hot under the collar, by figuring how many homes this amount of fuel would heat.

They might also try to figure out where the transportation came from, how much was used, and what relief they might have had if that transportation had been used to carry fuel for our own citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

#### INACTIVE DUTY TRAINING AND ROTC LEGISLATION

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, considerable interest is developing in two bills now pending before the House. They were reported by the Education and Training Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee late in the first session. I am chairman of the subcommittee involved.

Of the two bills, the most important is the so-called inactive duty training pay bill which would authorize inactive duty training pay for Army and Air Force Reserve officers, thereby putting them on par with Navy and Marine Corps Reservists and members of the National Guard.

The other bill is the ROTC bill which proposes to expand and make certain refinements in the ROTC system. This bill also makes provision for an Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps for the first time in our history.

I would like to have it clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that I am very much aware of the importance of these two bills to the civilian components of the Army and the national defense. Nevertheless, I have not yet moved to seek a rule from the Rules Committee to activate either of these bills. It is not surprising that this gives some of my good

friends on both sides of the aisle considerable concern.

After second thought, however, I think that my friends in the House will realize that public questions involving vast sums of money should be delayed when there is reasonable possibility that the legislative solution proposed may have to be changed considerably before the legislation can be enacted. At this time, there is meeting in the Department of Defense a special committee appointed by Secretary Forrestal and headed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Mr. Gordon Gray, whose function is to completely resurvey the reserve problems of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. One of the problems to be considered by this special committee is the determination of the proper emoluments for the various reserve components as well as their interrelationship, such as the relationship of the National Guard to the Army Reserves and the relationship of the Naval Militia to the Naval Reserves. This study also is to encompass the possibility of joint usage of reserve training facilities in an effort to save vast investments of money, manpower and materials. It will also consider the officer training programs of the various services and seek to eliminate any unnecessary differences between them.

I have taken the position, and have so advised the military, that it would be improper for me to attempt to secure the approval of the House of Representatives on this legislation at a time when the Department of Defense is actively considering the possible revision of certain problems affecting the Reserve components. This seems to me to be eminently logical and fair and, for that matter, I would say that it is the only sensible way to proceed. May I also say, Mr. Speaker, that it would be inappropriate also in my view to proceed with this legislation at a time when the Department of the Army is unable to furnish fully the instruction material and training facilities for its own reserves. Additional armories are necessary as all of us know before these components can be adequately trained. Further, additional Army planning will be necessary before its reserves can be profitably trained. I have been pursuing this phase of the matter with the Department for some time.

So I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that a brief delay in enactment of the inactive duty training pay bill will have very harmful results. In fact, a brief delay may well be very helpful, in that it may assist Mr. Gordon Gray in reaching an early decision with respect to the major questions involved in this exceedingly important subject.

I wish also to make it clear at this time, Mr. Speaker, to my friends on the floor of the House of Representatives and also to my good friends in the Reserve chapters throughout the country, that I am not personally opposed in any way to this legislation. Neither is it my intention to withhold action on it indefinitely. On the contrary, I do propose to seek action on this legislation this session and, I hope, favorable action. But again I say that in my opinion the House of Representatives should not act until it has available the



advice and conclusions of the expert, special committee now surveying this entire field by direction of the Secretary of Defense.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HARDIE SCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement by Mr. William Rhinehart.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including an editorial and also a newspaper article.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders entered for that day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### MISLEADING DISCUSSIONS OF MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 5003) to provide for the allocation of meat, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and a similar Senate bill, are mischievous proposals. Their net effect will be to make meat scarcer and harder to get during the coming year. I know that the gentlemen who are sponsoring this legislation are not deliberately trying to reduce the supply of meat available to the average consumer in this country, but that is going to be the effect of their proposals and of all the discussion going on in this country today, in high places and low, on the question of meat shortages.

This discussion is mischievous because the best available estimates from both Government and private sources indicate that the per capita supply of meat this year will be above the average consumption in recent years.

There need be no shortage and there will be none unless it is an artificial shortage, created by the fear generated by misleading discussions of possible shortages and threats of rationing and price controls. Reports from all over the country indicate that this fear is resulting in the hoarding of meat on the part of consumers everywhere, something

that is easily possible because of the great number of frozen food lockers. They indicate also, because of the uncertainty as to controls, that producers and feeders of livestock are sending immature and unfinished animals to market and are reducing the scope of their operations.

This is thoroughly understandable because, with controls on meat and no controls on the prices of feed, wages, and other production costs, no farmer can safely make his plans for months ahead, which he must do if he stays in the livestock business. Producers are willing to take their chances with the law of supply and demand, with the risks of weather, and pests, and diseases, but they understandably are reluctant to add to these the additional risk of what may come out of Washington if we are going to start in with controls.

The estimated per capita consumption of meat for 1947 was 156 pounds. The estimate for 1948 is 146 pounds, or 6.5 percent less. Figured out in terms of daily consumption, it means that consumers will have to reduce their daily consumption for 1948 by less than half an ounce, as compared with 1947. But that is not all. With the exception of 1946 when the per capita consumption was about 153 pounds, and 1947, consumers will this year have more meat than they have had in any year, going back as far as 1910. They will have more than 20 pounds per capita above what was consumed on an average between the years 1935 and 1939.

Is this any cause for a panic? Is there going to be any suffering in this country because our available supply of meat is going to be half an ounce less per day than it was during the year of our greatest consumption? Is this any excuse for going back to controls, which even those with the shortest memories know mean black markets, outrageous prices, and empty meat counters? Let us use our heads.

#### TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently tried to reduce the high cost of living of the city dweller by every means at my disposal, including voting for tax reduction and other alleviating measures. To that end I have today joined other Members of the House, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], in introducing a bill to eliminate the tax on oleomargarine. I hope the House will pass this measure.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, may be dispensed with.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object,

as I understand the gentleman's unanimous-consent request would obviate Calendar Wednesday tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I take this opportunity and still reserve the right to object to ask the distinguished majority leader in the absence of the chairman of the Rules Committee—I having addressed the chairman of the Rules Committee 2 weeks ago in regard to four bills, three of which were unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee, and the well-known bill on universal military training, which passed the House Committee on Armed Services by a two-thirds vote—can the majority leader on behalf of the Rules Committee or the leadership of the House give me any idea when I may expect an answer from the chairman of the Rules Committee?

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman of course knows, that is a question to be addressed to the committee. I might say to the gentleman from New York that one of those bills on which he asked a rule was reported from the Rules Committee and the gentleman called it to the floor and brought it to passage.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We very much appreciate that. The bill passed the House by unanimous vote, but we have other bills in the same category.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORBLAD (at the request of Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include transcript of a broadcast by Jack Beall on January 10, 1948.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Secretary of State Marshall.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the New York Journal American.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### THE FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the past 2 weeks have seen an

unrivaled cold spell attack the regions of up-State New York and the Northeast. Ice is 3 feet thick in some spots. Snow is deep and the weather is generally overpowering.

Reports come from my section that there is some suffering and considerable discomfort from the winter. The 20-percent shortage of fuel oil from normal supplies is bound to cause such misfortune. While State authorities are doing what they can, I believe it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to act likewise.

With careful distribution, much of the suffering can be eliminated. The first duty of the petroleum industry, it seems to me, is to take care of fuel-oil users who have homes and families to keep warm. Their need is paramount.

Behind the iron curtain, the proletariat is considered only after all favored groups and government commissars are taken care of. This is true with fuel as it is true with other necessities. The people get what is left and have to like it.

But we live in America, where cold and hunger are supposed to be unknown. We are said to enjoy the highest standard of living in the world.

Therefore, to preserve this great country, people must be kept safe from the ravages of the elements. I call upon business and the proper agencies of Government as well to cooperate in the equitable distribution of fuel oil.

To stimulate such cooperation, I am introducing the following bill, which the House should pass before this critical emergency threatens the whole Nation.

My bill reads:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Congress hereby directs the President to call representatives of the Department of Interior and of the petroleum industry together for the purposes of:

1. Taking immediate care of all persons who heat their homes with fuel oil and who now find themselves in desperate straits because of lack of it.

2. Assuring home users of fuel oil that they will be given priority over other users, at least up to 1,000 gallons.

3. Securing adequate additional supplies of fuel oil at the earliest possible moment from sections of the United States not suffering from extreme cold and arranging for the shipment of these supplies to areas where shortages of fuel oil exist.

#### ALLOCATION OF GRAIN TO THE DISTILLING INDUSTRY

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the special session the Congress gave the President power of life and death over the beverage-distilling industry, to allocate that industry's grain until January 31 next, on the theory that by the end of this month the President and the Secretary of Agriculture should be able to prove whether or not there was a sufficiently serious food shortage to warrant the restriction of all grain processors in their use of grain. Now I understand that the ad-

ministration is saying, in effect, that they have not had enough time to prove a shortage and provide an orderly method of allocating grain to all users, but that they must keep the use of grain rationed. A bill has been introduced in the Senate giving them until February 29, 30 days more. I think we ought to give them 60 days; let us get this whole question of the alleged need of controls straightened out once and for all. Accordingly, I am introducing today a resolution extending the effective date of that provision of Public Law 395 allocating grain to distillers to March 31, 1948.

In a word, what I am saying is this: If the President or the Secretary of Agriculture have not had time to demonstrate a bona fide grain shortage and to set up an allocation system for all users of grain, we should now give them until March 31, approximately 2½ months, and during this period the beverage-distilling industry should be allowed a fair and adequate amount of grain with which to continue their operations and to provide full employment for their workers.

#### BARUCH PROPOSALS

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute to call to the attention of the House the testimony of Mr. Bernard Baruch yesterday before a committee in another body. In my opinion this testimony of Mr. Baruch is one of the best-balanced proposals that we have had in regard to our foreign-aid program, and I commend to the Members of the House a careful consideration of the 11 points brought out in the Baruch proposal as presented to the committee in the other body yesterday. Most of us are convinced that aid to the western European nations is absolutely necessary for their rehabilitation and for a peaceful and stable world. We also realize that aid from the United States will be a subtraction from our total supply of goods, foods, machinery, medicine, and moneys. Such a subtraction must be made in an orderly manner or its effect on our domestic economy will be subject to justifiable criticism. The Marshall plan must be spelled out in the coming weeks in a practical and common-sense manner. In my opinion Mr. Baruch's 11 points lay the practical basis and common-sense principles which must be carefully considered in the spelling out of our aid program to the 16 nations of western Europe. It provides a framework for the proper coordination of our domestic-production economy with the foreign-aid program. I include at this point the 11 points as outlined in this morning's Washington Post:

#### TEXT OF 11-POINT BARUCH PLAN

Here is the text of the 11-point program recommended by Bernard M. Baruch to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"1. The United States stand ready to buy all nonperishable raw materials produced

anywhere and by anyone in the world for the next 5 years, and which cannot find normal commercial markets: Minerals, metals, and ores, both crude and refined jute, sisal, etc., yes, even wool and cotton. Also up to 750,000 tons of crude rubber. This should be made a part of the European recovery legislation.

"2. Extend the President's present tariff authority for the next 3 years.

"3. That the countries of Europe—as many as are willing—band themselves into a political, economic, and defense union under the United Nations. This would include the lowering of trade barriers among them.

"4. That the United States, and such others as will join us, mutually guarantee the nations entering this union against aggression. By guaranteeing I mean a firm promise to go to war in joint defense if any of them are attacked.

"5. That the European nations organize to liberate and use every productive resource of the Continent, with those of the Ruhr regulated under priorities and international control so as to protect the peaceful interests of Germany's neighbors.

"6. Stabilize all European currencies and establish realistic rates of exchange.

"7. A 2-year production drive in this country—to work for peace as we worked for war—where feasible, with longer hours and overtime; where not, to smash production bottlenecks.

"8. As part of this work-for-peace drive, an across-the-Nation anti-inflation program to stabilize for peace, including:

"(a) Reduction of major food and agricultural prices in exchange for guaranteeing farmers an assured price for their crops for the next 3 years, with ample soil conservation.

"(b) In return for this roll-back, stabilization of wages.

"(c) Restoration of the excess-profits tax by 50 percent of the cut from war levels, with wartime amortization for new plants.

"(d) Continued rent controls, with provision only for clearly justifiable increases.

"(e) Postpone tax reduction for 2 years, after which a 5-year orderly reduction of personal and corporate taxes combined with the systematic, substantial lowering of the national debt which is a terrible threat to our security.

"(f) Put off all less essential works, including Federal, State, and municipal projects, giving priority to increasing production, housing, schools, hospitals, and other more essential needs.

"(g) Set up a capital issue committee, with advisory powers, under the Secretary of the Treasury, to review all capital issues, public and private, with a view to deferring less essential projects. The Governors of each State should appoint committees to pass on all proposed projects at the local level before going to the Federal committee.

"(h) Congress to set up a digging committee to scrutinize all Federal works and expenditures to determine which are postponable; also where Government spending can be cut and whether it is being done most economically. 'Cut costs for great efficiency' is a sound business maxim. It applies to governments as well.

"(i) More production—so important that I repeat it.

"9. Settle realistically all prewar and wartime intergovernment debts. For example, Britain and her creditors must decide what is to be done with the \$14,000,000,000 of frozen pound sterling accumulated during the war.

"10. The British and others to retain their empire preferences for 3 years.

"11. A general staff for peace to develop an over-all, global strategy for America's peace-making."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in



one an editorial appearing in the Daily Northwestern, of Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and in the other a radio broadcast by George E. Reedy.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one a radio address delivered by him, and in the other a letter with an editorial enclosed.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Reader's Digest entitled "Hidden Red Ink in TVA Books."

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Alien Property Custodian.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### RED INK IN THE DAILY TREASURY STATEMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the daily Treasury statement should be printed in red ink, and I would introduce a bill to that effect, but I am afraid I would not

be successful in having it passed. Now, according to the statement of the Treasury of January 15 it shows that we have spent \$231,832,000 more than it has taken in. That puts us in the red for the year to date; with a debt of \$256,558,000,000 we must not go in the red. The thing that worries me and the thing that is going to keep us in red ink is the fact that the President did not say a word in any of his messages about economy in Government. That is the thing that disturbs me. He has charge of all departments of Government. He is only interested in asking the Congress to appropriate \$17,000,000,000 for the people in foreign countries. He is asking us to appropriate for universal military training the sum of \$3,000,000,000, and for socialized medicine it will cost about \$800,000,000.

The President wants aid to education for \$500,000,000. He wants five hundred million for interest on the public debt. He is always asking for more money for more things for the Government to do. Where will you get all this money? The people want less taxes. How can you cut taxes, cut the public debt, and keep on spending? I say it cannot be done. So, Mr. President, I say to you and the Congress, Cut out your foolish and unnecessary spending. Where is the end going to be? Everything will be red pretty soon.

#### VETERANS' INSURANCE LEGISLATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a bill which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing into the House a bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, to protect the insured against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from accumulated credits. It will save insurance for thousands of veterans, Mr. Speaker. The bill may not go through; the committee may not decide to favor the bill, but I think something of this sort should pass in order to protect the veterans who have allowed their insurance to lapse and to give the veterans the benefit of surpluses due them. It is a very precious possession to them, and I believe that something should be done. Our Committee on Veterans' Affairs had a hearing relating to the purposes of the bill.

The National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 as enacted and now in force provides that the United States shall bear the cost of administration and shall bear the excess mortality cost and of cost of waiver of premiums for total disability traceable to the extra hazards of the military or naval service as such hazards may be determined by the Administrator.

This is a promise on the part of the Government to the insured that the Government shall bear all expenses and all

payments to be made on account of death and disability traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service. This leaves to be paid out of the accumulated premium payments by the insured only the civilian death claims remaining after excluding payments of war connected deaths and disabilities required to be made wholly by the Government.

The bill provides for a prompt credit of dividends to each insured veteran to cover the excess of the premiums paid over the civilian death claims. The credit begins with the end of the insured's first policy year and continues at the end of each policy year. Any premium not paid when due is paid as of the due date by being charged against his credit. Three percent compound interest is added to the credit at the end of each policy year.

The present NSLI of October 8, 1940, is verbatim the same as the Government Insurance Act of 1917 in requiring the premiums charged to be based on the American experience table of mortality. This was then uniformly recognized by the United States and the States and used by the life-insurance companies for insurance on standard civilian risks. No change was made in this until after a study of the 10-year experience of the life companies between 1930 and 1940, the insurance commissioners of the United States and the District of Columbia in cooperation with the life insurance companies agreed on the new 1941 commissioners standard ordinary mortality table which shows a lower death rate, particularly in the younger ages. The death rate is, however, about the same for ages approaching 60 and many years thereafter. This new mortality table has been adopted by the legislatures of more than two-thirds of the States as the compulsory basis for standard life risks insured by the companies beginning in 1943.

The savings in the lower number of deaths shown by the new table as compared with the rates of premiums paid on the basis of the old table entitle the insured to dividends which are illustrated in the following table per \$1,000 of insurance:

Age at entry	American experience table of mortality, 5 year term	Commissioners standard ordinary mortality table, 1941	Excess for dividends
18.....	\$7.58	\$2.30	\$5.28
20.....	7.70	2.43	5.27
22.....	7.81	2.59	5.22
24.....	7.93	2.77	5.16
27.....	8.17	3.11	5.06
30.....	8.41	3.56	4.85
34.....	8.88	4.35	4.53
38.....	9.59	5.46	4.13

This means that a young man entering service at age 18 and having the premiums of \$7.58 deducted from his pay or paid during 3 years would have accumulated dividends of \$5.28 during each year. This would keep his insurance in force for more than the entire 8 years of possible present term insurance. The same would be true for a young man entering at age 20 and paying for 3 years. For a young man entering at age 30 who pays premiums for 4 years, the dividends

would keep his insurance in force for the whole 8-year period of term insurance. In every such case there would be a remaining credit to be applied to his converted insurance premium or to a continued term premium if the term rate should be extended.

Even for those serving or paying for less than the 3 or 4 years stated there would be a substantial accumulation of dividends to carry the insurance in force for a proportionate number of years.

The bill I referred to is as follows:

A bill by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act to protect the insurance against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from the excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from the accumulated credits.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, is amended by inserting in section 602, at the beginning of subsection (f), a paragraph number (1) and adding at the end of subsection (f) a new paragraph (2) to read:

"(2) Every insured veteran shall be credited with an annual dividend on each policy, as of the end of the first and of each succeeding policy year, equal to the difference between the current mortality contribution of the policy on the mortality and interest basis prescribed in subsection (e) of this section as paid by the insured by deduction from pay, or from a dividend accumulation, or otherwise, and the net mortality losses chargeable to the policy on the basis of actual experience excluding any losses traceable to the extra hazard of the military or naval service; provided, that prior to any other determination effective after the taking effect of this act, it shall be assumed that such net mortality losses are based upon the expected mortality computed on the basis of the 1941 Commissioners Standard Ordinary Table of Mortality.

"From the date of the original policy all premiums deducted from the pay of the insured, or otherwise paid, together with all dividends and optional additional payments made, if any, accumulated as of the end of each policy year with interest at the reserve rate, shall from time to time be applied; first, to pay any premium as of the due date; second, to reduce any premium loan against the policy; and third, on termination of the policy by surrender or death any remaining credit be paid in the same proportion and manner as other payments to the insured or to the beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"Unless the insured in a converted policy shall elect otherwise in writing, any premium not otherwise paid shall be paid as of the due date from the accumulated dividend credit, and any remaining unpaid premium shall be paid by a premium loan against the policy to the extent that, as of the end of the current policy year, the total accumulated indebtedness shall not exceed the reserve.

"Interest under this subsection shall be accumulated at the reserve rate.

"No dividend or remaining credit shall be paid in cash in any case other than on surrender of the policy or as a part of payments to a beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"No policy shall be held to have been lapsed or shall be lapsed for nonpayment of any premiums which have been or are being paid by a charge against the dividend accumulated credit or by a premium loan as herein provided.

"The Veterans' Administration shall give prompt notice to the insured of dividends and unpaid premiums, if any, and of the remaining accumulated credit or charge, and within 6 months after the taking effect of

this act give notice to each insured whose policy shall have been lapsed of the requirements for reinstatement."

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an address I made some time ago. I also ask that my address may follow the address of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill he introduced today.

#### FUEL SHORTAGE

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly as to the current situation in New England with reference to the continuing shortage of fuel oil.

First, at the request of the chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], I am glad to report that the committee arranged a special meeting to consider the analysis I had made of the proposed export program of petroleum products for the first 3 months of this year. I referred to that in detail in my remarks yesterday, which may be found at page 329 of the RECORD. Yesterday I requested the committee staff to check on the accuracy of my analysis, and the staff reported to the committee that it was in agreement with it. The committee instructed its staff to immediately secure an explanation of the program from the Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce.

Next, I wish to report that the weather situation in New England remains very severe. News accounts reaching here this morning indicate that in eastern Massachusetts a record cold was registered. In central Massachusetts the mercury dropped to 45° below, an official low record. In western Massachusetts temperatures between 8° and 25° below were registered. As Members from Pennsylvania, New York, and the Central and Midwestern States know, this is a terrific burden on the depleted fuel-oil supplies. On top of that, the sixth snowstorm in 25 days in parts of Massachusetts aggravated conditions. The news account states that 47.2 inches of snow has fallen on storm-weary Boston up to now.

I have been trying to keep closely in touch with the current situation in western Massachusetts, and upon inquiry

yesterday afternoon I received the following telegram from Hon. Robert F. Bradford, Governor of Massachusetts:

Continued cold weather; rapidly increasing seriousness of fuel-oil situation in Massachusetts. Temperatures last week averaged 9.7° below same period last year. Urgent that all possible steps be taken to obtain additional supplies for Massachusetts.

Yesterday, at pages 302-303 of the RECORD, I reported in detail upon a constructive suggestion which had been made by a subcommittee of the New England delegation as early as December 13, 1947, and upon subsequent correspondence with Hon. John R. Steelman. I stated that I had sent another wire to Mr. Steelman yesterday morning, indicating I would appreciate his advice as soon as possible as to the results of General Fleming's investigation and the practicability of converting heating facilities in Government buildings from oil to coal and as to the accuracy of a report which I brought to his attention on January 13, that within the past few weeks Stewart Field, N. Y., and Fort Myer, Va., had converted from coal to oil. I stated I had had no reply to my letter of January 13. I regret to advise the Members that, as of a few minutes ago when I left my office to come to the floor, I had not received an acknowledgment of my letter or any reply to the telegram which I sent yesterday. Consequently, I have sent another wire to Mr. Steelman, reporting on Governor Bradford's wire, and again asking for the courtesy of an immediate report on General Fleming's investigation and as to the accuracy of the report of recent conversions at these two Army installations. The wire is as follows:

Referring to telegram December 13, second telegram December 19, your letter December 19, my letter January 13, and my telegram yesterday, may I quote from a telegram I have received from the Governor of Massachusetts: "Continued cold weather; rapidly increasing seriousness of fuel-oil situation in Massachusetts. Temperatures last week averaged 9.7° below same period last year. Urgent that all possible steps be taken to obtain additional supplies for Massachusetts." I shall appreciate report on results of General Fleming's investigation and as to accuracy of information reported in my letter January 13, so that I may inform the New England delegation immediately and include it in report to Governor Bradford as to all efforts which have been made by all members of New England delegation to obtain additional supplies for Massachusetts.

I do not know how much fuel oil is being consumed daily in the gigantic and scattered institutions owned or operated by the Federal Government. If any is being consumed where reconversions could have been made promptly after the suggestion of December 13, then more than a month's supply of an unknown amount of this now precious fuel has been consumed unnecessarily.

I insist that the Federal Government has had ample opportunity to examine the possibility of reconversion all over the country and to have taken constructive action. Surely, any fuel oil which could be saved in this manner in areas where the weather conditions are not severe could have been diverted to those



who so desperately need it. Too, it is obvious that any such release of shipping space would help to break the bottleneck of transportation to these areas. Many witnesses have testified that there is ample oil if we can only get shipping space. I am supremely confident that our colleagues from those areas would definitely approve of such a governmental policy in behalf of the people of our districts and I cannot understand this apparent delay in action by the executive department. If it is not feasible, it is simple enough to state so and explain the reasons. If it is feasible, every 24 hours lost in taking the action is the loss of some amount of fuel oil which might mean the difference between keeping a school, a hospital, or an industry in one of our districts operating 24 hours longer. It is reasonable to believe that it would keep scores of houses warm and this is a matter of prime importance where every householder is concerned and obviously of the greatest importance where there may be sickness or elderly people or children living in such a house.

Finally, I again state that I believe it is the clear responsibility of the executive department to take vigorous and effective action in every field in which they can be of assistance. That was not only the request, but the formal recommendation of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in its resolution adopted December 19, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 11760, as follows:

(8) The President and the departments and agencies of Government should take all other possible and appropriate action to utilize such powers as they now possess to aid in alleviating such shortages.

Already, too much time has elapsed. All too much irreplaceable fuel oil has gone. There is no excuse for any further delay. In my opinion, it has been a case of too little and too late. I not only ask in behalf of my constituents, whether they be Democrats or Republicans or independents, I demand immediate action. I hope each of you, if your constituents are affected, will do everything in your power to support the efforts of your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and of those of us, irrespective of party, who have been working together toward the simple end of preventing this situation from becoming worse and of curing it, if it lies within our power to do so. I know that, even if your constituents are not affected, you are interested in the well-being of your fellow Americans and I ask you, too, to support us.

**REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 501)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems

covering its operations from April 1, 1947, to September 30, 1947, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b) (5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for the above period.

Previous reports of the National Advisory Council were transmitted to the Congress on March 1, 1946, March 8, 1946, January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively. Previous reports on the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank were included in the reports of January 13, 1947, and June 26, 1947, respectively.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 19, 1948.

LOUIS H. DEEVER

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3111) for the relief of Louis H. Deaver, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "United States Employees' Compensation Commission" and insert "Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Federal Security Agency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVA L. DUDLEY

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1799) for the relief of Eva L. Dudley, Grace M. Collins, and Guy B. Slater, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, CASE of New Jersey, and CRAVENS.

**PRIVATE CALENDAR**

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

**BELMONT PROPERTIES CORP.**

The Clerk called the bill (S. 851) for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Belmont Properties Corp., Arlington, Va., the sum of \$687.50. Such sum represents the amount of a fee paid by the said corporation to the Federal Housing Administration in connection with an application, made on October 20, 1941, to such Administration for mortgage insurance

on an apartment-house project in Arlington, Va. While such application was pending the land on which such project was to be constructed was condemned by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTHA M. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4331) for the relief of Bertha M. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bertha M. Rogers, of Frederica, Del., widow of John R. Rogers, Sr., the sum of \$8,285.47; such sum having been awarded to the said John R. Rogers, Sr., by an act entitled "An act for the relief of William J. Simpson and John R. Rogers, Sr.", approved July 11, 1946 (Private Law 716, 79th Cong.), and the said John R. Rogers having died prior to receiving such award or any part thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAYATO HARRIS OZAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 387) for the relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13C of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to permit Hayato Harris Ozawa, the husband of Shigeko Elizabeth Tamura Ozawa, a citizen of the United States, and the father of two children born in the United States, to remain permanently in the United States, provided he is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHEMINA PIPER ENZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 560) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for per-

manent residence of Wilhemina Piper Enz, who entered the United States at New York, N. Y., on December 1, 1943, and that she shall, for all purposes under the immigration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. KEUM NYU PARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Keum Nyu Park, Honolulu, T. H., shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted on March 9, 1938, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record Mrs. Keum Nyu Park as having entered the United States for permanent residence on March 9, 1938."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DR. GISELA PERL (KRAUSZ)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1139) for the relief of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Dr. Gisela Perl (Krausz) as of March 2, 1946, the date she was admitted temporarily to the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the period insert "Upon the enactment of the act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Rumania of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: On page 1, line 7, strike out "March 2, 1946" and insert in lieu thereof "March 25, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANASTASIOS PANAGE IOANNATOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1298) for the relief of Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ioannatos or Tom Panage Yanatos).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization

laws, Anastasios Panage Ioannatos (known as Anastasios Panage Ioannatos or Tom Panage Yanatos), of Santa Fe, N. Mex., who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States in time of war and has resided in the United States of America since January 18, 1926, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on January 18, 1926, the date that he entered the United States at New York, N. Y.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued with respect to the said Anastasios Panage Ioannatos.

SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the non-preference category of the first available Greek immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MITSU M. KOBAYASHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi, who is the wife of Edward T. Kobayashi, a citizen of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, that provision of section 19 (c) of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 889-890; 54 Stat. 671-673; 56 Stat. 1044; 8 U. S. C. 155), which denies the benefits of its provisions to persons racially inadmissible or ineligible to naturalization in the United States, shall not be held to apply to Mitsu M. Kobayashi who last entered the United States in the year 1926

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LAWRENCE EDGAR EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2218) for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration laws, Lawrence Edgar Edwards shall not be subject to sections 3 and 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 878, 889; 8 U. S. C. 136, 155).

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Lawrence Edgar Edwards as of April 7, 1946, the date upon which he was admitted temporarily to the United States at Detroit, Mich."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. DAISY A. T. JAEGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2250) for the relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers, New York, N. Y., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at New York, N. Y., on March 11, 1942, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, after the period insert "Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Portugal of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUGUST DANE TETUAEARO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of August Dane Tetuarearo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien August Dane Tetuarearo, of Ryde, Sacramento County, Calif., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration laws, the said August Dane Tetuarearo, whose wife is a citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry therein in the year 1925.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### VICTOR C. KAMINSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3061) for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski, also known as Victor Kaminski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski), of Wilmington, Del., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date and at the place of his last entry therein.



With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the period, insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Poland of the first year that said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TECH. SGT. TSUYOSHI MATSUMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3263) for the relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1140; 8 U. S. C. 703, 57 Stat. 600), Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto, who served honorably in the United States Army and who entered the United States temporarily as a student in 1937, may be permitted to remain permanently in the United States if he is found to be admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to persons of races ineligible to naturalization.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ESTHER RINGEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 420) for the relief of Esther Ringel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1947 (39 Stat. 889-890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156) and section 14 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 162; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 214) in the case of Esther Ringel, any previous or existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Esther Ringel should be deemed to be lawfully a resident of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JOHN T. HOLLANDSWORTH, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 99) for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the account of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr., postmaster at Beckley, W. Va., with the sum of \$2,000, on account of a shortage of that amount in his War Savings stamp account.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TROY CHARLES DAVIS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 258) for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Troy Charles Davis, Jr., of Denver, Colo., a merchant seaman entitled to medical treatment and hospitalization at Government expense, the sum of \$211.32, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him in connection with an emergency operation which it became necessary for him to have performed in a private hospital in Denver, Colo., because of the lack of a marine hospital in that city: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LUCY JEFFERSON WEIL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 339) for the relief of Lucy Jefferson Weil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to pay, out of the civil-service retirement and disability fund, to Lucy Jefferson Weil, the widow of Isaac Weil, a former employee of the United States, an amount equal to the amount which would have been refunded to her under the provisions of section 12 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, with respect to the employment of the said Isaac Weil during the period from August 1, 1941, to November 7, 1944, had not such employment been in contravention of the automatic separation provisions of such act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COL. WILLIAM J. KENNARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 957) for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Col. William J. Kennard, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$950, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between (1) the amount he was actually allowed as compensation for the value of the personal property which he lost as a result of the invasion of the Philippine Islands by the Japanese in December 1941, and (2) the amount which should have been paid to the said Col. William J. Kennard as compensation for the value of such property: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed

guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADA B. FOSS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1039) for the relief of Ada B. Foss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ada B. Foss, of Cape Porpoise, Maine, the sum of \$275.99 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for accrued annual leave earned by her husband, the late Justin A. Foss, as a lighthouse keeper at the Goat Island Light Station, Cape Porpoise, Maine, the said Justin A. Foss having been prevented by his death on December 26, 1942, while serving in the United States Coast Guard, from making application under the act of August 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 616), as amended, for payment for such accrued leave: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FRANK J. SHAUGHNESSY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1043) for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to credit the internal-revenue account of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y., with the amount of \$468, representing certain moneys received by and in the custody of John V. Franey, deputy collector of internal revenue, Binghamton, N. Y., as internal-revenue collections, and which were stolen by an unknown person in a hold-up of the branch office of the collector located at Binghamton, and which were not turned over to the said Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, for deposit.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FRANKIE STALNAKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1100) for the relief of Frankie Stalnakar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frankie Stalnakar, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of \$2,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by her, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by

her on December 7, 1944, in Baltimore, Md., as a result of being struck by a United States Government mail truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,500."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARMATZ to the committee amendment: In lieu of the sum "\$1,500" insert "\$4,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAFFEY ROBERTSON-SMITH, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 350) for the relief of Caffey Robertson-Smith, Inc.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF MARY D. BRIGGS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased, former postmaster at Los Angeles, Calif., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$2,796.60, which sum remains due as the result of a defalcation of one Clyde T. Suttle, then a clerk in the Los Angeles post office, in the amount of about \$9,000, less amounts regained from the surety on the bond and by judgment against the said Clyde T. Suttle. All charges against the postmaster's account of the said Mary D. Briggs arising from the embezzlement of the said Clyde T. Suttle shall be remitted, and the Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to release to the personal representative of the said Mary D. Briggs the amount to her credit in the civil-service retirement and disability fund which has been retained because of such shortage in her account.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "charges", insert the word "remaining."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL W. POORVU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1169) for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$8,288.45, to Samuel W. Poorvu, of Boston, Mass., in full settlement of all

claims against the United States for expenses incurred in connection with the leasing of quarters for Wellesley branch of the post office at Boston, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE REVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1286) for the relief of Lawrence Reves.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$129.48 to Lawrence Reves, of Duck Hill, Miss., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Lawrence Reves on the 20th day of May 1946 as the result of the negligent and wrongful operation of a United States Army vehicle at Camp McCain, Miss., by a member of the armed forces of the United States who was not then and there acting within the scope of his office and employment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by an agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOR THE RELIEF OF A. S. OSTEN AND GUY F. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1516) for the relief of A. S. Osten, certifying officer, and for the relief of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That A. S. Osten, certifying officer of the Federal Public Housing Authority, be, and is hereby, relieved of financial liability by reason of erroneous payment in February 1943, in the sum of \$2,386.54 under disbursing office symbol 86-774, and the Comptroller General is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, by reason of such erroneous payment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD W. BIGGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1653) for the relief of Edward W. Bigger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Edward W. Bigger, who is alleged to have sustained injury in the line of duty on or about August 15, 1940, while employed as county administrative officer for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in Marion, Crittenden County, Ark., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Edward W. Bigger may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 5, strike out the words "United States" and insert "Bureau of."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "Commission" and insert "of the Federal Security Agency."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARRY L. NOVICK ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of Mrs. Harry L. Novick and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Harry L. Novick, the sum of \$850, to pay to the estate of Randolph Bolles, the sum of \$813.60; to pay Mr. and Mrs. John C. Clark, the sum of \$320; all above claimants of Jacksonville, Fla.; to pay Marie F. Merwin, of Palatka, Fla., the sum of \$926.05, in full settlement of all claims listed herein against the United States for property damage, as the result of a United States Army plane crashing in Jacksonville, Fla., on July 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "Mrs.", strike out the bill down to the colon in line 2, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof "Margaret Lee Novick, of Miami, Fla., the sum of \$275; to pay the estate of Randolph Bolles, deceased, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$639; to pay to Mr. and Mrs. J. C. Clark, of Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$203; to pay to Marie F. Merwin,



of Palatka, Fla., the sum of \$466, in full settlement of all claims of said parties against the United States for property damages sustained by them as the result of the crash of two United States Army airplanes in Jacksonville, Fla., on July 20, 1944."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Lee Novick and others."

#### MICHAEL ABARNO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2009) for the relief of Michael Abarno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Michael Abarno, Staten Island, N. Y., the sum of \$15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Michael Abarno against the United States on account of the death of his minor son, Vito Abarno, who was fatally injured on July 15, 1943, when the automobile in which he was a passenger was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Tompkins Avenue and Wadsworth Avenue, Staten Island, N. Y.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Michael" and insert in lieu thereof "the estate of Vito."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$15,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Michael" and insert in lieu thereof "estate."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "his minor son."

At the end of bill add: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Vito Abarno."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FRANK A. CONSTABLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2269) for the relief of Frank A. Constable.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank A. Constable, Detroit, Mich., the sum of \$1,211.61. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Frank A. Constable against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on May 12, 1942, when an automobile owned and driven by him was

struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Woodward Avenue and Eleven Mile Road, Detroit, Mich.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,211.61" and insert "\$711.61."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ORAN CURRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2386) for the relief of Oran Curry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 944, which is an identical bill, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Oran Curry, of Neola, Utah, the sum of \$587.33, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States as compensation for quarters in connection with services rendered the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, at the Uintah-Ouray Indian Agency and Reservation in Utah, from May 1926 through March 1933, inclusive, this being the amount due him and remaining unpaid under his contract of employment, as certified by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated by this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding \$1,000.

SEC. 2. No charge shall be made against the disbursing officer or the certifying officer nor shall any claim be made against Oran Curry, for the amount of the overpayment of \$35 made on certificate of settlement No. 0858898, dated August 21, 1944.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed. A similar House bill (H. R. 2386) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HARDY H. BRYANT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2479) for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hardy H. Bryant, the sum of \$2,032.34, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for performance of certain service not covered by his contract with the Post Office Department to carry mail on screen wagon route 450002 at Beaumont, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JAMES W. ADKINS AND MARY CLARK ADKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2489) for the relief of James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000, to James W. Adkins and Mary Clark Adkins, of Moncks Corner, South Carolina, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, James Jervey Adkins, sustained as the result of a bullet fired from a .22-caliber automatic pistol in the hands of a United States Navy officer from the deck of a vessel in the waters of the Cooper River, in Berkeley County, South Carolina, on March 8, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### E. W. EATON COAL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2697) for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

# LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROSE MARY AMMIRATO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay the sum of \$5,000 to the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for personal injury on August 30, 1944, by reason of the negligent driving of a post-office truck which resulted in certain injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 6, 7, and 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States mail truck at the intersection of Fourteenth Avenue and Sixty-first Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., on August 20, 1944: *Provided*,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# E. J. BRENNAN AND JANET HOWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3067) for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, Chief Disbursing Officer, in the amount of \$220.70, for moneys advanced to Janet Howell, agent-cashier at the National Training School for Boys, which was stolen from the safe at the institution on April 12, 1946, and that Janet Howell, agent-cashier, also be relieved of accountability in that amount; and that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized and directed to pay out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$35.17 to Janet Howell to be credited to the personal accounts of inmates whose funds were stolen at the same time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MRS. MAE H. FITZGERALD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3159) for the relief of Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mae H. Fitzgerald, of Mineral Wells, Tex., the sum of \$10,742.15, in full settlement of

all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and property damages, sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army truck and trailer on Highway No. 77 near Davis, Okla., on November 4, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,742.15" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MARTIN A. KING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3300) for the relief of Martin A. King.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Martin A. King, postmaster at Clarks Summit, Pa., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$410.53. Such sum represents a shortage in the amount of the said postmaster caused, without fault on his part, by the robbery of post-office funds on the night of July 27-28, 1934, from the post-office vault. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of said postmaster in the sum of \$410.53. The sureties of the said postmaster are released from any liability to refund to the United States the whole or any part of such sum of \$410.53.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# JESSE L. PURDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3550) for the relief of Jesse L. Purdy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jesse L. Purdy, a classified city carrier in the United States post office, Akron, Ohio, the sum of \$55.47. Such sum represents the salary (a) which was paid to the said Jesse L. Purdy for 7 days annual leave and 1 day sick leave taken by him during the period beginning July 16, 1945, and ending January 15, 1946, while he was on duty as a temporary rural carrier, and (b) which he was required to refund to the United States because he was not entitled to payment for such leave. The said Jesse L. Purdy took such annual and sick leave after having been erroneously advised by post-office officials that he would be paid for such leave.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# WILLIAM C. REESE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3937) for the relief of William C. Reese.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay William C. Reese, of Birmingham, Ala., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained from the kick of a mule on October 15 or 25, 1917, while the said William C. Reese was in the performance of his duty as an employee of the Goodrich Construction Co. engaged in the construction of an Army camp as a subcontractor under authority of the United States, said injury having been sustained through the negligent or reckless act of a soldier of the United States Army in charge of such mule whilst in the performance of his duties as such soldier: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# MRS. CLINTON R. SHARP

The Clerk called the bill (S. 84) for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States (8 U. S. C. 213 (c), 703), Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp, Japanese wife of Clinton R. Sharp, a United States citizen and veteran of World War I, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed without presenting immigration visas or other travel documents. Upon such admission, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Japanese of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# IOANNIS STEPHANES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 136) for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Ioannis Stephanes (alias John Stephens), of Mountain City, Nev., who entered the United States in August 1925 and has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulation, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on payment of the visa fee of \$10 and head tax of \$8.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.



ANNA M. KINAT (MRS. JOHN P. TAYLOR)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 166) for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation in the case of the alien, Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor), and she shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which said warrant and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. YONEKO NAKAZAWA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws, Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa, who was admitted to the United States on May 16, 1930, as the minor child of a treaty trader, is hereby declared to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to cancel all outstanding deportation proceedings in respect to the said Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa. Upon the enactment of this Act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Japanese of the first year that the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS ABADIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 185) for the relief of Thomas Abadia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Thomas Abadia, of Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence in 1940, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Thomas Abadia upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SANTIAGO NAVERAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 186) for the relief of Santiago Naveran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Santiago Naveran, and is directed

not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Santiago Naveran, who arrived at Tampa, Fla., on or about July 7, 1924, as a seaman on the steamship *Sec. II*, which he deserted on or about July 10, 1924, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at such place and on such date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that such quota becomes available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO ARGUINZONIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 187) for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Antonio Arguinzonis, of Shoshone, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Antonio Arguinzonis upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIMON FERMIN IBARRA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 189) for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Simon Fermin Ibarra, of Twin Falls, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on March 14, 1940, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Simon Fermin Ibarra upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PEDRO UGALDE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 190) for the relief of Pedro Ugalde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pedro Ugalde, of Twin Falls, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on May 18, 1940, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Pedro Ugalde upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JULIAN URIARTE

The Clerk read the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Julian Uriarte.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Julian Uriarte, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on July 19, 1931, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of the said Julian Uriarte upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUAN LLONA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 192) for the relief of Juan Llona.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Juan Llona, of Boise, Idaho, shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on July 11, 1926, the year of his actual entry into the United States, upon payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Juan Llona upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available Spanish immigration quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 298) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Pedro Bastida and Fidel Acordarrementeria, both of Battle Mountain, Nev., legally admitted as seamen, but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of \$10 and the head taxes of \$8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## DAMIAN GANDIAGA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1579) for the relief of Damian Gandiaga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Damian Gandiaga, of Tuscaror, Nev., shall be held and considered to have lawfully entered the United States for permanent residence on June 3, 1944, the date of his actual entry into the United States, upon the payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8; and the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced in the case of Damian Gandiaga upon the ground of unlawful residence in the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that the Spanish quota is hereafter available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HILARIO A. GOITIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 358) for the relief of Hilario A. Goitia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Hilario A. Goitia, 609 H Street, Los Banos, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted at Galveston, Tex., on February 10, 1927, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the first available quota for Spain."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: Page 1, line 7, after "residence", insert "upon the

payment by him of the visa fee of \$10 and the head tax of \$8."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BETTY ISABEL SCHUNKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 421) for the relief of Betty Isabel Schunke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of the fifth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875-878, 8 U. S. C. 136 (c)), the Attorney General is authorized and directed to permit the entry into the United States for permanent residence of Betty Isabel Schunke, Potts Point, Sydney, Australia; wife of Sgt. Edwin A. Schunke, United States Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), Betty Isabel Schunke, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MICHEL FERAPONTOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 892) for the relief of Michel Ferapontow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Michel Ferapontow, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence at the port of New York on or about November 29, 1945. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Russian quota of the first year that the same Russian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## VIKTOR A. KRAVCHENKO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 896) for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Viktor A. Kravchenko, of New York, N. Y., shall not be subject to the provisions of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), of section 19 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 155), and of sections 305 and 328 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C.,

1940 ed., title 8, secs. 705 and 728); and for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Viktor A. Kravchenko shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted as of September 1, 1944, to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Attorney General is directed to record the admission to the United States on August 18, 1943, at Niagara Falls, N. Y., of the alien Viktor A. Kravchenko, as a lawful admission for permanent residence. In the administration of the immigration laws, the said Viktor A. Kravchenko shall not be regarded as having been at any time prior to the enactment of this act a person within the provisions of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 137), or those parts of sections 3 and 19 (a) of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, secs. 136 and 155 (a)), which relate to aliens who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property, or anarchy, or the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law or the assassination of public officials, or similar classes, and he may be naturalized, if otherwise eligible, regardless of the provisions of section 305 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 705).

"Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall reduce by one number the quota of the alien's nationality for the fiscal year then current or next following."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1572) for the relief of Basque aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Bartolome Errea, Marcelino Yturbe, Francisco Lorono, Pete Elguezabal, Zenon Zubieta, Francisco Alluntiz, Damin Gandiaga, Manuel Zulueta, Jose Antonio Odrizola, Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida, all of eastern Nevada, legally admitted as seamen but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of \$10 and head taxes of \$8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct 11 numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Damin Gandiaga," and after "Zulueta" insert "and."

Line 8, strike out "Fidel Acordarrementeria, and Pedro Bastida."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "eleven" and insert "eight."

The committee amendments were agreed to.



The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**PHILIP LEE SJOERDT HUIZENGA**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1859) for the relief of Philip Lee Sjoerd Huizenga.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Philip Lee Sjoerd Huizenga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on November 5, 1945, at San Francisco, Calif., if he is admissible under the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas. Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for China during the first year that the said China quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MARGARET KATHERINE HUME**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1927) for the relief of Margaret Katherine Hume.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Margaret Katherine Hume, of Fortine, Mont., and is directed not to issue any such further warrants or orders in the case of such alien insofar as any such further warrants or orders are based upon the same grounds as the warrants or orders required by this act to be canceled. For the purposes of the immigration laws, the said Margaret Katherine Hume shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on the date and at the place of her last entry therein.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MRS. MARIAN D. McC. PLEIN**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3039) for the relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (c)), Marian D. McC. Plein, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "(c)" and insert "(e)."

Line 5, after the first comma, insert "as amended."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MRS. FLORENCE BYVANK**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1009) for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the amount of the insurance under the Government life-insurance policy (No. K 720604) of Clarence A. Byvank to Florence Byvank, his widow and designated beneficiary, in accordance with the terms of such policy, beginning with the first calendar month following the month during which this act is enacted, notwithstanding the lapse of such policy in December 1931. The insured, Clarence A. Byvank, applied for reinstatement of such policy in February 1932 and transmitted payment for back premiums thereon at the time of application but died suddenly from monoxide gas poisoning on March 30, 1932, before a report of his medical examination had been filed with the Veterans' Administration.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**FRANK DURANTE AND OTHERS**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3224) to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and two children, namely, Paul Durante and Patsy Durante.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156), in the case of Frank Durante, Maria Durante, Paul Durante, and Patsy Durante, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Frank Durante, Maria Durante, Paul Durante, and Patsy Durante shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same fact upon which the outstanding proceedings rest.

With the following committee amendments:

On line 7, after the name "Durante", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On line 8, after the name "Durante" and the comma strike out the names "Paul Durante and Patsy Durante."

On line 10, after the name "Durante", strike out the comma and insert the word "and."

On line 11, after the name "Maria Durante", strike out the comma and the names "Paul Durante, and Patsy Durante."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Frank and Maria Durante."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**ROBERT WILHEM GERLING**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3742) for the relief of Robert Wilhem Gerling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission of Robert Wilhem Gerling, of New York City, N. Y., as of August 4, 1939, the date on which he was lawfully temporarily admitted to the United States. The said alien shall be admitted to become naturalized without complying with the provisions of section 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 1153; 8 U. S. C. 731): *Provided*, That he is found otherwise eligible for naturalization under all the provisions of existing laws.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "admission", insert the words "for permanent residence."

On page 1, line 5, substitute the name "Wilhelm" for "Wilhem."

On page 1, lines 8 to 13, inclusive, strike out all following the period after the word "States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Robert Wilhelm Gerling."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**DOMINGO GANDARIAS**

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 3849) for the relief of Domingo Gandarias.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Domingo Gandarias, of eastern Nevada, legally admitted as a seaman but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of \$10 and a head tax of \$8.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**LADISLAV VAIDA AND OTHERS**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4403) for the relief of Ladislav Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ladislav Vaida, Elena Vaida, and Stefano Vaida, who entered the United States at New York on December 28, 1945, and that they shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as immigrants for permanent residence as of that date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one number the immigration quota of Czechoslovakia, and by two numbers the immigration quota of Hungary, for the current fiscal year.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN A. DILBOY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of John A. Dilboy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of John A. Dilboy as of July 2, 1925, the date he was admitted temporarily to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Turkish quota of the first year that the said Turkish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MABLE GLADYS VIDUCICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2557) for the relief of Mable Gladys Vidulich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136 (3)), Mable Gladys Vidulich, the wife of a citizen of the United States who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), if she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That completes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

CHARLES E. CROOK

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of Charles E. Crook be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

EDWARD H. ISENHART

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 664) for the relief of Edward H. Isenhardt be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

#### AMENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 430 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order

to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute committee amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

I now yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 430 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2873, which is a bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This bill is known as the Rockwell bill, as it was introduced by my distinguished colleague from Colorado, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands that reported this legislation.

This is an open rule, providing for 3 hours' general debate. I understand that the bill was reported unanimously by the House Committee on Public Lands. However, in order to be entirely frank and honest with the House, I must state that the bill does not come to the floor with the unanimous approval of the Rules Committee. There was a division in our committee and some members are opposed to certain provisions of the bill. They voted to report this measure to the House with the understanding that their opposition be noted.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation. It is a complicated and intricate bill. It is exceedingly technical in its terms. I am not going to undertake to explain the bill, because I am sure the committee will be able to do that to the entire satisfaction of the House. As I have indicated, there is controversy over certain provisions of this bill and a sharp difference of opinion concerning some of its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments under our reclamation program are recognized by all. We have seen the benefits which have accrued from the great reclamation projects in the Western States. I am confident Congress will continue to develop and expand this program.

This is one of several bills, as I understand, which the Committee on Public Lands will bring to the House to perfect

the procedure involved in approving new projects, and to clarify existing rules and regulations. This bill has the approval of Mr. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

This is a bill over which there has been a great deal of controversy and wide differences of opinion in the committee. The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has been working on this legislation for more than 3 years. I understand it is a compromise measure; that it is not exactly what any member of the committee desired, but in order to bring a bill to the House it was necessary for members to give and take. The different members have made concessions in order that the bill might be reported out.

I am going to mention one or two provisions over which there will be controversy. There will be considerable debate over the period of time specified in this bill for the repayment of power projects. At the present time 50 years is the time fixed for the repayment of money used for the development of public power. This period is now being extended to 78 years. I know some of the Members feel that is a little too long. However, the bill is open to amendment, and every Member will have an opportunity to express his attitude.

Another controversial feature is the interest rate to be charged on power projects. At the present time interest is being charged on the amount allocated to power on these projects at the rate of 3 percent. The Reclamation Act of 1939 is not altogether clear on just what disposition is to be made of the funds obtained from this interest charge. Under what is known as the Solicitor's opinion, rendered several years ago, all of this money has been retained by the Bureau of Reclamation for expenditure on the project. This practice has not met with the approval of the irrigation and water people of the West who have contended that these funds should have been returned to the reclamation fund in the Treasury Department and reappropriated for the development of additional reclamation projects. A compromise was finally worked out, as you will note from the bill. This interest rate has been reduced to 2½ percent, of which 2 percent is turned back to the reclamation fund in the Treasury Department, to be reappropriated by Congress for the development of other projects. One-half of 1 percent is to be retained by the Bureau for use on the particular project on which the interest is collected.

The bill also provides that recreation, silt control, as well as fish and wildlife preservation, may be taken into consideration by the Secretary of the Interior in determining whether or not any particular project is feasible. I know some members of the Rules Committee expressed concern over this provision. I believe, however, that there is nothing to be disturbed about, and in my opinion the amount which would be charged to these particular features would be very small as compared with the cost of the entire project.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHENOWETH. I yield.



Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman mentioned the fish and wildlife provision. What limitation is there in the bill as to how much may be charged that leads the gentleman to the conclusion that it will not be very much?

Mr. CHENOWETH. There is no limitation, I may state to the gentleman from Virginia, but the bill makes no change in the present procedure for the approval of reclamation projects. In other words, the Secretary must determine that the project is feasible before he can proceed with the construction of the same. If the allocations do not equal the total estimated cost then he must submit the project to Congress and we will have the opportunity of passing upon the amounts charged to recreation, fish and wildlife, and all other estimates in his report.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take further time to mention other provisions of the bill. I wish to state that I am going to stay with the committee on this bill. I do not think anyone is fully satisfied with this measure, but it is the best the committee can write after 3 years of work.

I feel that it is a question of taking this bill or have no legislation at all. I believe that some legislation is very desirable and essential at this time in order to promote and develop reclamation in our Western States.

We must develop the natural resources of our country. It has been proven that reclamation is of benefit not only to the arid States of the West where these projects are located, but to the entire Nation. Water is the life blood of the West and turns deserts into garden spots. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation has determined this bill to be necessary. I urge that the rule be adopted and the bill pass as submitted by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of a bill that is highly important to the West. I must say that this legislation is long overdue, for some such legislation as that contained in the bill that will be brought before the House under the adoption of this rule has been called for during the past 3 or 4 years.

As early as 1945 there was a call made by several Members of this House for clarifying legislation. The law that is sought to be clarified is the Reclamation Act of 1939. One part of that act seemed ambiguous and there was a difference of opinion, and a controversy arose over the interpretation of that act. It was therefore sought to be clarified, and after many, many weeks of hearings beginning back in 1946 the bill that is before us was reported out by the Public Lands Committee. It was a unanimous report on the part of the Public Lands Committee, and I hope that the House will not hesitate to vote this rule so that the merits of the measure can be fully discussed. The Appropriations Committee, one of the great committees of this

House, has asked for some such legislation as is before us if the rule is voted. If no action is taken today and this measure is not made in order, no chance to clear up the confusion may occur and the cause of reclamation would be hampered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is of far more importance to reclamation and to the country generally than the sparse attendance of the Members this morning would seem to indicate.

This bill makes some very radical changes in the Reclamation Act. I believe every Member of Congress is deeply sensible to the advantages of reclamation and the necessity for these reclamation projects, and, therefore, it is all the more important that legislation on this subject should be sound and should be businesslike. We should not let down the bars to logrolling and pressure groups, but we should continue the program upon a sound businesslike basis.

Now, there are some things in this bill to which I wish to call attention this morning because I think it ought to go back to the committee from which it came and be corrected. I am not the only one who thinks so. I know reclamation is a popular vote-getting subject in some areas of the country, but I think you have got to put it on a broader principle than that if you are going to sustain the program over the years and the generations that are to follow. There is such a wide field in the matter of reclamation in the West that this Congress should not take the responsibility of weakening that program by inappropriate concessions in order that unsound projects may be approved.

Let us discuss the method by which these reclamation projects are approved. There are certain principles laid down under which the Secretary of the Interior shall examine each individual project, and if he is convinced that it will be self-liquidating over a certain period of years, then he shall so certify and it then becomes automatically authorized. If the Members of this House think that after a project is proposed in the future it will come back here and you may have the opportunity to correct it by authorization, I want you to be disabused of that impression because under this bill—and under present law for that matter—you have delegated absolutely to the Secretary of the Interior the power to authorize any project that he sees fit under the terms laid down by this bill.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Of course, the gentleman knows that the Secretary of the Interior would have to come back to this Congress to get an appropriation, even though he found the project to be feasible.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BARRETT. And the House would have to vote on it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Of course, you have to get an appropriation for anything that is authorized, but it is the function of the Congress to authorize appropriations and you have delegated to the Secretary of the Interior the function which the Congress is supposed to perform.

Mr. BARRETT. That delegation was made quite some time back and it is existent at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; it is existing law.

Mr. BARRETT. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is one thing which surprises me about my friends who are now in control of the House. You have inveighed for years against bureaucracy and against delegation of authority to the bureaucrats to do this and that. I am wondering what has come over the spirit of your dreams when now you propose to reaffirm and lend your stamp of approval to this delegation of authority which is your constitutional duty to perform.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I merely want to call the attention of the gentleman from Virginia to what the gentleman from Wyoming mentioned. There is no change being made in the present procedure by this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is what I am quarrelling about and I am surprised at gentlemen on that side of the aisle not desiring to make some change.

Mr. CHENOWETH. It is my understanding this committee is making a further study of the reclamation law and it is very possible the committee will come in later with some such provision as the gentleman is now suggesting. The present controversy deals principally with the interest charges and the period in which the project may pay back. I do not know whether the committee gave any attention to the other or not. I am not informed on that.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad that the gentleman has finally paid such a fine compliment to the Democratic bureaucrats that they are willing to continue and reaffirm by legislation this delegation of authority.

Now, let us see what is in this bill that is new. Well, the law as presently laid down is that in order for the Secretary of the Interior to authorize one of these programs he must find that certain things exist, certain advantages, and they are enumerated in the present law. But, this bill adds to those things. This bill arranges it so under provision No. 7, which you will find on page 5 of the bill, that in determining the feasibility of a program, of a proposed project, that the Secretary of the Interior shall take into consideration not only the commercial benefits, not only the flood-control benefits, not only the irrigation benefits, but shall take into consideration recreational advantages and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and when they do take that into consideration there is no limitation of how much of this allocation may be charged up to propagation of wild tadpoles and other

wildlife, and after you have done that it is further provided that this provision to take care of the fish and rabbits and other wildlife shall not be charged back and shall never come back into the Treasury of the United States.

Now, is that sound, gentlemen? Does that sound businesslike, or is that what you Republicans, in the days of Harry Hopkins, used to call boondoggling? I am sort of ashamed of you fellows when you bring in a provision like that, and I say it in all seriousness, and I mean what I say that this bill ought to go back to committee. I remember when you gentlemen came into power in this House, a lot of people in this country were encouraged; they were encouraged to believe that you were going to have sound policies; that you were not going to propose any boondoggling; that you meant what you said about Harry Hopkins and the other New Deal boondoggling projects that too much money had been spent on, and we were encouraged to believe that you were going to help economize and balance the budget and bring down the cost of Government. And I voted with you a lot of times last year in the hopes you were going to do it and meant business. I remember that you started out pretty good and you voted down a lot of the reclamation appropriations that you did not think were sound. But something happened. Somebody got scared. An election year was coming on. And, after you had cut out all those projects and had reduced the budget some—you know you promised to reduce it \$6,000,000,000—and when you got done, when you finished up and put in all of these reclamation projects and all the other little things that the logrolling was about, what happened to that budget that you were going to cut \$6,000,000,000? Get your pencil and look, and you will find that when you get through with this year's appropriations you will have appropriated more money than the President of the United States recommended in his budget.

Now, gentlemen, I am interested in reclamation. Everybody is interested in reclamation, but if this reclamation business is going to work it has got to be sound. You cannot mix up sound reclamation with the preservation of fish, and recreation, and tadpoles, and rabbits and all the other little old things that you have got mixed up in this bill. Now, all of you know it. Why do you not take this bill back to your committee and cut out the boondoggling and bring in a bill here that we can all be happy about and proud to support? What is the reason for this boondoggling provision about the fish and the wildlife? Now, you understand that whenever you build a dam you are going to make a nice swimming hole and you will probably make a few little swimming holes back in the tributary streams, and you will revive the old swimming hole that the boys used to go to after school and sometimes before school was out, and I reckon that the Secretary of the Interior is going to have to take a census of all the little fish in those creeks so as to see how much of this can be charged up to boondoggling and then, of course, you have to take a census of the rabbits, and you have to take a census

of the tadpoles, and then you have to figure out the infant mortality of the tadpoles so as to figure how many are going to turn into good edible frog legs in the course of time. Is that what you gentlemen are offering the people of the United States as an economy program? Do you mean what you have got in this bill, or do you mean what you are telling the people of the United States and what I hope you meant when you told the people of the United States? Are you going to pass this bill this morning and put your stamp of approval on a boondoggling project that Harry Hopkins in his brightest dreams never conceived of? Is that what you are offering the people of the United States as a program? All right.

I know what I say is not going to amount to a hill of beans. You are going on here today. You are going to talk about reclamation for 3 hours, so you can send some speeches back home and maybe mend up a few of the holes that you made last year when you cut out some of this stuff. That is what you are going to do. When it is all over, you are going to vote for this bill, Democrats and Republicans, and you are going to put this hoax on the people of the United States. When you do it, you are doing the greatest kind of an injury to the reclamation doctrine itself, because all reclamation is based upon the idea that this money is going to be paid back in a period of time, and that that same money, as Congresses come and go and generations come and go, can be reappropriated so that we may have other reclamation projects in the great West. Yet you are going to stop up the flow of that money back into the Treasury, you are going to stop it up by boondoggling with fish and rabbits and what have you.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, of course I do not believe the very ingenious argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, in which he now says the Republicans have started on a boondoggling spree, is going to be taken very seriously by anyone. He has been in Congress a long time. I admire him a lot. We are on the Rules Committee together. He talks about voting with the Republicans. We respect his ability. We are glad when he votes with us, he should do so more frequently. But do you know what he is trying to do right now? The gentleman is a consistent party man. He wants to defeat this proposed legislation. Do you know what his party will be saying in a short time if it is defeated? "Look what these Republicans are doing to reclamation." He talks about tadpoles and frog ponds, and all that kind of business.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. No; I cannot yield right now. I have only 5 minutes. I would love to yield otherwise.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wish the gentleman would yield, when he talks about me.

Mr. RIZLEY. There are some people here that happen to live out on the plains of Texas. I happen to live out on the

plains of Oklahoma. Of course we do not have the Potomac flowing by as does the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. I do not think it is going to wreck the economy of this country and I do not think anybody ought to accuse anybody of boondoggling if some of these reclamation and flood-control projects have just a little bit of money in them for recreation. That is a very insignificant part of this bill, a very insignificant part.

The facts are that this legislation is needed, and needed badly. If you believe in reclamation, if you believe it is necessary to harness some of these streams and use some of the water for irrigation, then certainly we need this legislation. Let us see the position that the gentleman from Virginia would put us in. What is his remedy? His remedy is to leave the law just like it is, exactly as it is today. That is the only remedy that he suggests, except that he says he would send it back to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I cannot yield right now.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman should not put words in my mouth unless he is willing to yield to me. That is not a fact.

Mr. RIZLEY. I will yield to the gentleman in a moment.

Mr. Speaker, the facts are that the Committee on Public Lands have been working on this bill for more than 3 years and have unanimously agreed on this bill. Talk about sending it back to the committee for further action—they have had this legislation for about 3 years and have been working on it intensely. I am not one of those who is going to come in here—and I do not know when the gentleman from Virginia first saw this bill, but I did not see it until last Friday, and I doubt if he did—but I am not going to say to the Committee on Public Lands who have been working on this bill as well as to other committees who were working on it until the reorganization bill came along, "You fellows do not know anything about what you are doing. You are just a boondoggling crowd. You are just a bunch of boondogglers and we want to send it back."

I think this rule ought to be adopted. The rule is wide open and we will have some amendments offered on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman said that I wanted to send it back. I do not care about sending it back if you will cut out the frills and foolishness contained in it. Does the gentleman favor this provision about wildlife and game?

Mr. RIZLEY. I am going to do just as the gentleman from Virginia is going to do. I am going to be here and vote for such amendments as I favor, and I will vote against those amendments which I do not believe should be in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is a fair enough answer to my question.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman.



Mr. BARRETT. It seems to me that the gentleman from Virginia is taking a rather inconsistent position, if I understand correctly. He contends that these big flood-control dams should be constructed in these Eastern States on a wholly nonreimbursable basis, so that the people of those States do not pay a nickel toward the cost of construction of the dam. But when it comes to a matter of building them out West, he takes an entirely different position and says that the multiple-purpose dams built in the West, part for flood control, part for navigation, part for irrigation, should be paid for in their entirety by the farmers, and that none of the cost should be nonreimbursable, and that all of these other items which are for the benefit of the general public should not be charged to the public, but should be charged to the poor farmers who are trying to make an honest dollar.

Mr. RIZLEY. I think the gentleman's observation is very well taken.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. This item on wild-life conservation is not really insignificant and certainly I do not believe such expenditure can be classed as boondoggling. Remember when we build a dam on the great rivers of the Northwest, if we do not put in fish ladders, we are going to destroy or injure the salmon industry. Putting in such fish ladders has been done along the Columbia River, and should be done elsewhere. A great industry depends upon it. Should that be charged up to the farmers who use the water? I contend it should not be. It should be a nonreimbursable item. There are other nonreimbursable provisions in this bill that ought to be considered favorably.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in reclamation, but I am interested in seeing that reclamation is carried on in this country so that it is going to be beneficial to the people in the Western States where they need reclamation, to such a degree that the people in the Western States feel that it is a wise and good thing for the United States to adopt such a bill as this one now before us.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] spoke about the Columbia River fish ladders. You know what has happened to the fish industry on the Columbia River. You have almost wrecked it. It is not now what it used to be. You westerners are to blame for that.

Now, you also have in this bill a 78-year period for repayment, where the former legislation required repayment in 50 years. If you put in this bill 78 years before these debts are repaid, you break faith for good legislation; your own farmers out there do not want it. Your own people are not anxious to have it in the legislation, but some smart politicians are trying to adopt that with the idea that it is going to help recla-

mation, in the guise that the politician will benefit. Shame on the politicians.

I suggest you make the time 50 years to pay; that is too long. Ever hear of a bank making a loan for 78 years? Ever hear of one for 50 years? Then let us cut down the time and be sensible. We need all the sense we have if we want cents in the Treasury, and more water on the land.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have predicted that certain sections of this bill would bring about just such a show on the floor of this House as we just witnessed a moment ago.

I shall not oppose the rule. I believe that every bill as important as this should have its day in court, and should stand or fall on its own merits or demerits.

There are certain sections of this bill to which I am vigorously opposed. The Secretary of the Interior at this time, under section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939, has more power than any man in these United States should have to authorize projects. While some may say this bill does not extend that authority, the facts are that this bill puts the stamp of approval on that authority which is granted to the Secretary of the Interior in section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and then some by inference, at least, if not specific.

I am also opposed to the 78-year pay-out period provided in the bill. In my candid opinion, I do not think any project is economically feasible that cannot pay out in 50 years or thereabouts.

As many of you know, with two other members of the Interior Department Subcommittee on Appropriations, I took a 9,500-mile trip by automobile through the Western States last fall.

We talked to hundreds and possibly thousands of people, to people who are electric power and water users; and I can frankly say that no one expressed any great concern about the costs of electric power or water for irrigation. What they want are sufficient appropriations by Congress to insure the building of good projects. They need water, which is liquid gold to the West; and they have need for more power in some sections of the West. The thing they want is for the Congress to appropriate sufficient money to carry on those projects.

I know most of the Members of Congress, and I believe I can say all of the Members of Congress are in favor of developing the West and of appropriating sufficient money for the completion of reclamation projects, hydroelectric projects, and everything else that is proper and feasible for the Western States; but to disturb that good feeling which now exists with the bill extending the pay-off time to 78 years is disturbing to a lot of us. This Treasury of ours needs money brought into it faster rather than to have it come in slower. I did not find anybody in the Western States who was not willing to pay his bill. True, we have flood control in every section of our Nation which is nonreimbursable; which is a national responsibility. I found no

one in the West who did not want to pay his own freight. I have five counties along the Missouri River. I want the Missouri Valley program to go forward under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now doing and will continue to do a good job developing that great area which covers one-sixth of the United States. I am also deeply interested in the development of the West. If anyone feels I am not he simply does not know my heartbeats. The best indication is the fact that I spent seven long weeks together with two other members of my committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FULTON, and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Congressman SCHWABE, traveling night and day and Sundays, too, to see those projects out there so as to appropriate the right amount as near as is humanly possible for each project. I know the Congress is in harmony with that purpose today. To disturb it with such a provision as is contained in this bill, giving the Secretary more power, delegating power to the Secretary of the Interior which the Congress should reserve to itself, will hurt the West. Also let me remind you, my colleagues, that 78 years is equal to the time from Grant to Truman. I shall offer amendments at the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This bill further sanctions public electric power development. That is the socialization of electric power development. Is not that true?

Mr. JENSEN. To some degree it might because of the fact that under the 78-year pay-off program it may not be necessary to raise Federal power rates on many hydroelectric power-producing dams to the end that private industry will not be able to compete with the Government power rates. We of this Congress must defend the private power companies who are doing a good job in most instances furnishing power at reasonable rates and giving good service. We must defend them against unfair Government competition just as vigorously as we do the farmer or the peanut vendor or the corner grocery man.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman spoke of the Missouri Valley project. Does that provide for a 9-foot channel on the Missouri?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. How far up?

Mr. JENSEN. To Sioux City, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of certain recent statements in the press regarding the relationship between the recommendations of the President's Air Policy Commission and universal military training, I find it necessary to make the following observation:

There are no grounds for reaching the conclusion, either from the recommendations of the Air Policy Commission or after an examination of present security requirements, that a 70-group air force program could be an effective substitute for universal military training. Mr. Finletter and his associates confined the scope of their excellent study to the role of air power in a future war. They did not examine the role of the ground forces or of the surface Navy, nor the means required to maintain these and their respective Reserve components at the level of strength and degree of readiness commensurate with the national safety. This training bill would provide the nucleus for Army, Navy, and Air Reserves and directly benefit the National Guard.

It is noted that the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training, which reported its findings on May 29, 1947, set down six essentials of an integrated program, all of which it deemed absolutely necessary to the national security. These included a mobile striking air force and universal military training. The Commission did not consider one the substitute for the other. The Commission reported, "We cannot sacrifice any one of these elements for any other. They must all be taken care of at the same time."

A powerful air force will be unquestionably the first line of American defense in a future conflict. Moreover, there is justification for the hope that such a force will serve in large measure as a deterrent to aggression against the United States, though it should be emphasized that a 70-group air force, built around 700 heavy bombers, is not an overwhelming force even by standards of World War II, as the Air Policy Commission carefully points out.

It cannot, however, be considered a conclusive deterrent to an attack upon the United States. If war comes, it will come without warning, exposing the whole of the American countryside to widespread casualty, panic, and demoralization. Without trained men in every community instantly available to reorganize essential services, replace broken communications, care for the wounded, and perhaps repel airborne invaders, it is quite possible the country would never recover from the initial blow. There will be no time to train men after an emergency has arrived, yet trained men will be needed by the millions to augment the Regular forces in their counteroffensive effort, and to keep the home front intact and operative. Almost certainly it will not be possible to distinguish combatant from noncombatant. Every American will be involved.

In the circumstances, it would be exceedingly dangerous if the American people allowed themselves to be soothed by the illusion that a striking air force and universal military training are interchangeable elements of a security program. Their missions are wholly distinct. Both are required to achieve the strongest possible deterrent to attack upon the United States, or to provide the indispensable success in the event of war.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I did not object to the majority leader's request to do away with Calendar Wednesday busi-

ness. At that time I explained to him that I had asked the Rules Committee and the Republican leadership of the House in an inquiry by letter as to when the members of the Armed Services Committee might be heard before the Rules Committee on the question of universal military training, and three other bills unanimously reported by the Armed Services Committee. There are 33 members of the Armed Services Committee. Two-thirds of the membership of that committee fully support the principle of universal military training.

The bill was reported by the Armed Services Committee by a vote of 20 to 0. I have in my office petitions from a million and a half Americans on this subject favoring it. Five out of six potential Republican candidates have declared in favor of it. Not one word was said at the Republican National Committee yesterday by the gentleman reporting our congressional program. He not even mentioned the name "universal military training." I say it is high time for the leadership of this House or the chairman of the Committee on Rules to either state openly that they are not going to give us a rule, or the reasons therefor. Otherwise I shall continue to object to obviating Calendar Wednesday, and when the proper time comes in the House the Armed Services Committee will call up this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times on Wednesday, January 7, entitled "The GOP and UMT."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The editorial referred to is as follows:

#### THE GOP AND UMT

No more important legislative business faces the present session of the Eightieth Congress than that of universal military training. This newspaper believes universal military training should be adopted. We believe it must be adopted if Congress is not to fail in its duty to the citizens of this country in providing for their security and is not to fail the peace-loving people of all the world in serving notice that the United States intends to remain strong in a military way until such time as threats of national aggression no longer exist. President Truman has repeatedly urged the establishment of such a system of training, and may confidently be expected to renew this recommendation when he addresses Congress today.

The decision whether UMT will be adopted at this session rests on the Republican leadership in Congress. Every opinion poll of the people for the last 3 years has shown an overwhelming majority in favor of some program of compulsory military training. Newspaper analysts of congressional attitudes believe that if Congress is given the opportunity it will pass such a bill. Five of the six leading potential candidates for the Republican nomination for the Presidency—Dewey, Warren, Stassen, Eisenhower, and MacArthur—have unequivocally supported UMT.

As matters now stand in Congress, the House Armed Services Committee has approved a bill establishing a compromise training program which is not so good as was hoped for, but which has been approved as adequate for the time being by the Army leaders who would have to direct it. This

bill, however, is now blocked in the Rules Committee, which is controlled by the Republicans. Without the committee's approval it is unlikely even to reach the floor of the House. There is no bill before the Senate and none in immediate prospect. That, too, is a Republican responsibility. Senator GURNEY, a Republican, heads the Armed Services Committee and Senator TAFT decides the order of consideration of bills in the Senate.

Senator TAFT in the Senate and Speaker MARTIN in the House, and their fellow Republican policymakers, will be gambling with the national security of the United States and with their own political fortunes, we believe, if they attempt to block debate of UMT. Yet it is being freely predicted that attempts will be made to do this. Mr. TAFT has put himself on record as against UMT—for reasons which do not stand careful analysis—while Mr. MARTIN is said to be lukewarm toward the proposed program.

This is no time for partisan division on questions of national security. It is no time for any small group of men, no matter how honest their motives, to decide in a caucus room that they will not permit debate on a question which the majority of their colleagues and a majority of their countrymen apparently favor. Two and a half years ago, in his final report as Chief of Staff, the now Secretary of State warned that "the timing of our decision on universal military training is urgent." "The officials of the State Department," Mr. Marshall said then, "have been strongly of the opinion that a decision in this matter prior to the final peace negotiations would greatly strengthen the hand of the United States in securing acceptance of a genuine organization to handle international differences."

The question is no less urgent today than it was on June 30, 1945. Two and a half years of a strained peace have not lessened the necessity that this country retain its military leadership. Any sign of weakness on the part of the United States, any indication that we are not ready to assume our proper responsibilities in maintaining the peace of the world, can only be an invitation to aggression, as it was in 1914, as it was again in 1939. Quick consideration and passage of a strong training bill would do much to assure world peace. A militarily strong United States would not be an invitation to war. It would be a guaranty against it.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might direct an inquiry to the members of the committee handling the bill, if I may have the attention of either the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] or the chairman of the committee.

For the purpose of the RECORD, I would like to ask if the phrase used in subsection 2 of section 9, "the estimated cost of the proposed construction," is intended to cover the costs that will be incurred in repairing damages that might be involved in construction. Now, I raise that question because subparagraph 7 refers to the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and so forth, apparently listing that as a benefit from the project. This morning the Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions for the War Department had before it representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service asking for funds to build some hatcheries and to do some other things to overcome the



damages to the salmon run created by the construction of the McNary Dam and other dams on the Columbia River. Now, then, what I am wondering about is if it will be understood that the phrase "the estimated cost of the proposed construction" will include such costs as this for the building of hatcheries or the doing of whatever may be necessary to offset damages to fish and wildlife.

Mr. ROCKWELL. May I ask the gentleman from Montana to answer that question?

Mr. DEWART. I think the gentleman should recognize that paragraph A of section 9 has to do with the report that will be made by the Bureau of Reclamation to the Congress in regard to the feasibility of projects. It specifies eight different items under which this report shall be divided.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall pursue the question further when we reach that point in the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2873, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2873 amends section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This bill, as amended, was favorably and unanimously reported by the Public Lands Committee on July 11, 1947.

#### HISTORY OF THE BILL

The Reclamation Project Act of 1939 was passed for the purpose of making more flexible the annual repayments required of irrigation water users under a reclamation project. Its passage followed the report of a commission appointed to investigate the repayment situation on all projects in the West. While this legislation was being considered by Congress in 1939, there was incorporated in it provisions for the authorization by the Secretary of the Interior of projects which conformed to a formula set up in the act. It is this formula which is amended by H. R. 2873.

The hearings on the Reclamation Act of 1939 discloses that the feasibility for-

mula was not too carefully scrutinized by Congress. The language of section 9, which H. R. 2873 amends, is ambiguous in some respects and has been subject to different interpretations.

The interpretation put on section 9 (a) by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior led to a controversy, and the introduction of legislation 3 years ago was intended to clarify this provision. Former Congressman Robinson, of Utah, introduced the first bill for this purpose. Extensive hearings were held but the Seventy-ninth Congress adjourned before the Irrigation and Reclamation Committee, which considered it, made any report.

Before the introduction of the Robinson bill and since then, the House Appropriations Committee has raised questions with respect to the way by which the Bureau of Reclamation set up repayment schedules for reclamation projects under section 9 of the act. The National Reclamation Association, representing irrigation interests in 17 Western States, took exception to the interpretation of section 9 by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior and passed resolutions urging clarifying legislation. Generally, it was contended by those who supported H. R. 2873 that the opinion of the Solicitor did not conform with the intent of Congress in passing the 1939 act. Further, it appeared that for 5 years after the act was passed, the Bureau of Reclamation had followed a practice which seemed to be in full accord with the intent of Congress in passing the act. However, after the Solicitor's opinion, which was rendered in 1944, the policy and practice of the Bureau changed. The Bureau contended, and probably correctly so, that it was bound by the Solicitor's opinion.

After H. R. 2873 was introduced and considered by the Public Lands Committee of the House, during the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the Senate Committee on Interior Department Appropriations included a statement in its report to the effect that clarifying legislation on this subject should be passed by Congress at the earliest possible moment.

Extensive hearings were held on H. R. 2873 in the form in which it was introduced. The issue involved was strongly contested by those appearing for and against the bill. There was a difference of opinion among members of the Public Lands Committee after hearings on the bill were concluded. Under this situation the committee made an effort to find a solution to the problem which would meet the views of all members of the committee. Finally, a proposal for amendments was suggested which was submitted to both the Bureau of Reclamation and representatives of reclamation interests in the West. This formula was accepted by both groups, written into the bill which, as thus amended, was unanimously approved by the committee.

I believe that the Members of this House will fully appreciate that the subject of this bill is very complicated and involved. It is not easily understood. Legislative language which has been carefully written and considered is required to cover the subject. Amend-

ments which are not carefully weighed may result in further confusion and lead to interpretations by the executive branches of the Government contrary to the intent of a committee which spent weeks in considering the bill. The committee is satisfied, after most exhaustive weighing of every provision of the bill, that all ambiguity has been removed.

#### THE ISSUE

The principal issue under this bill concerns the application of the returns from the interest component of power rates fixed on commercial hydroelectric energy produced by a reclamation project. This may sound complicated. Perhaps I can explain it in this way.

Under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, it was provided that the Federal Government's investment in the commercial power features of a reclamation project should bear interest at not less than 3 percent per annum. It would appear, from the language of the act, that this meant the payment into the Treasury of the United States of all returns from interest for the use of money. The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, however, held that interest, as there used, did not connote its ordinary meaning. He said that the Secretary of the Interior was empowered by this act, when construed with other provisions of the reclamation law, to apply the interest returns from the power investment to aid in repaying irrigation costs which were beyond the ability of the water users to repay. This meant, of course, that the Government received no interest on its investment in the commercial power features of a reclamation project; and it was contended by those who supported H. R. 2873 that the result was a subsidy from the Nation's taxpayers to Federal power developments.

It was clear that Congress should determine whether the apparent intention of Congress in passing the 1939 act should be sustained or whether certain holdings of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior should be recognized and written into law.

Some who appeared before the Public Lands Committee, as well as members of the committee, felt that the Government was justified for reclamation development to enact legislation which permitted the application of the interest component of power rates to aid in repaying irrigation costs. As chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee, I opposed such a position and believe that the Federal investment in the incidental power developments of a reclamation project should not only bear interest on unpaid balances during the amortization period but should be used to reimburse the Government for use of money borrowed to finance such developments. This interest return to the Government would be in addition to the return of the original investment.

With this explanation in mind, may I now point out the principal provisions of H. R. 2873. They are:

First. Interest component: This bill, as now amended, provides that the interest rate on the commercial power in-

vestment in reclamation projects shall be not less than 2½ percent per annum.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Is the purpose of that just to reimburse the Federal Government for the interest they paid to help build these projects so that the general taxpayer will not pay in taxes to take care of the project?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is the purpose; yes.

At least four-fifths of the returns from this interest rate shall be paid into the Treasury for the use of money. One-fifth of such interest rate may be assigned by the Secretary of the Interior to aid in repaying such irrigation cost of a reclamation project as are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. It is believed that under present cost of money to the Government the 2 percent will reimburse the Government for what it has to pay for borrowed money invested in power features of a reclamation project. The rates were fixed as a floor and accordingly may be increased as costs of money borrowed by the Government increases. Under this arrangement, specified in the bill on page 9, lines 10 to 23, inclusive, there will be paid into the reclamation fund, as provided by the act of May 9, 1938 (52 Stat. 291, 318), interest at not less than 2 percent per annum for the use of money invested in commercial-power features of a reclamation project. The returns from not less than one-half of 1 percent per annum may be assigned to aid in repaying irrigation costs.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the 1939 act did not specify any particular period for the amortization of the capital investment of the Government?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. How about the 1932 law? Is there not something in there that fixed it at a total of 50 years, the first 10 years during construction requiring no amortization payments, but the balance to be paid in the next 40 years?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I only know what the Department told our committee. Their contention is that under the present law there is no limit; that they could say that the project could run for 200 years, and that they are only bound by the Solicitor's opinion. That is the law as it exists today, barring any legislation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. At any rate, it has been the policy of the Department of the Interior and other agencies that have to do with this service to amortize the Government's investment over a period of 50 years?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think that has been the custom, yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This proposal is to increase that to 78 years?

Mr. ROCKWELL. This proposal is to make it possible to increase it to 78 years; to make it more flexible.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Now, with reference to the interest charge, in the gentleman's investigation of this matter

and in the hearings before the committee, was there any evidence that established the fact that the Congress had any intent in the 1932 or the 1939 acts to waive interest charges, or not to require the payment of interest on the money that the Government advanced to these parties, back into the Treasury?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That was the contention within the committee. The opinion of the Solicitor of the Interior Department stated that they must charge 3 percent interest, but after they had collected the interest they might use the money back on the project or for any purpose they desired connected with it. Therefore, they were not using it to go into the Treasury, but were placing it back as capital investment on the project.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. And they did that?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That has been the custom.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In order to stop that it was necessary for them to write a legislative provision in the appropriation bill, which was done last year, I believe?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is what the Appropriations Committee did last year.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This provision in this bill that requires not less than 2½ percent is a compromise with the Interior Department, which insisted on a 3 percent, which was not to go back into the Treasury?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Yes; it is a compromise between the Department and also members of the committee, many of whom contended there should be no interest rate charged on power development, that they should only pay the original investment back to the Treasury. There were two schools of thought, one of which believed no interest should be charged at all as is the case with irrigation projects where the money is paid back without interest. The other school of thought of which I was one felt that the Federal Treasury should be reimbursed to the amount that it cost the Treasury for the money. This we estimated at 2 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Colorado five additional minutes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Just one more question if the gentleman will yield further.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am sorry to take so much of the gentleman's time but I hope he will touch on that provision of the bill appearing on page 6 which reenacts what I understand to be existing law giving the Secretary of the Interior in effect the authority to enlarge authorized projects without specific authorization of the Congress. I hope the gentleman will discuss that because I am very much interested in that particular provision.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman stated that there were some members of the committee who were in favor of power projects not paying interest. If

the gentleman will recall, I think the true facts are that all members of the committee wanted power projects to pay interest, but some of us on the committee felt that the interest should be used to pay the irrigation part of the project which the irrigators could not pay, whereas the gentleman from Colorado and some other Members felt that the interest should be returned to the reclamation fund. In other words, we all wanted interest paid, but it was a question of how the interest should be applied. It divided the committee and finally there was an agreement whereby 2½ percent would be charged. One-fifth of that would go to the aid of the irrigators and four-fifths of it to the reclamation fund or the Treasury.

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is entirely correct, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico. I thank the gentleman for correcting the statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I should like to complete my statement, but I will yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In the comparison on page 4 of the committee's report, in section 5 of 9 (a), I notice there is a change in the wording from "power" to "commercial power." Will the gentleman explain if that has any significance in establishing a priority against municipal purchases in preference to private company purchases? As I understand it, now the municipalities have a priority right of purchase. By using the words "commercial power," changing the language from the one word "power" to the qualified phrase "commercial power," is there any significance?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I am not a lawyer, but I am sure it does not change the intent because the intent of the committee is that the REA and the local communities shall have the first right to this power.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In other words, it does not change the priority right of purchase.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I know that is the intent of the committee.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would call the attention of the gentleman from California to page 9, line 3, and to lines 24 and 25. That answers the gentleman's question, I am sure.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, proceeding with my statement:

Second. Amortization period for repayment of power investment: The repayment period for the investment in commercial power features of a reclamation project may extend to 78 years or the useful life of the project, whichever is shorter. The 1939 act does not contain any express provision on the repayment period for the commercial power investment, but the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation had been to fix this period at 50 years. It should be noted that the 78 years is not a fixed amortization period. The period may be for any period, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, up to 78 years. Further, during this entire period the investment bears interest on unpaid balances.



Third. Silt and salinity control and recreational benefits: The project cost for silt and salinity control and for recreational benefits are made nonreimbursable. This is justified because many a multiple-use project incurs additional cost to control salinity and provide for the retention of silt. These projects may also involve additional cost for incidental recreation values. Such costs are all in the public interest and should not be charged against the water users. Expenditures by the Government for flood control and for fish and wildlife are also in the public interest and under the present law are nonreimbursable. There is no reason why the cost of silt and salinity control and recreational benefits should not be put in the same position as flood control and as fish and wildlife expenditures. It should be pointed out, too, that under the present law if the Army engineers construct a project with incidental silt and salinity control and recreational benefits the costs for them are nonreimbursable. The same rule should be applied to multiple-purpose reclamation projects.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as I said a few moments ago while we were discussing the rule, this legislation or something like it has long been overdue. Correcting and clarifying legislation on the Reclamation Act of 1939 was called for in 1945. You will recall that the act of 1939 had provisions in it concerning the repayment with interest at 3 percent of the cost of commercial power facilities in these Government dams built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

A solicitor in the Department of the Interior in 1944 made a certain ruling or interpretation of subsection 9 (c) of the act of 1939. His interpretation was not acceptable to many Members of this House and to many water authorities throughout the country. In fact, the very powerful and influential National Reclamation Association at its next annual meeting went on record in its first resolution as condemning the view of the law as announced in the solicitor's opinion.

It was felt by Members of this House there should be clarifying legislation at that time. I was then chairman of the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and when called on to clarify the situation in a legislative way I said on the floor of the House in November 1945, that if the law is not clear we should clarify it and that I wanted to help in that matter. I made my view quite clear that the Congress makes the law and determines the policy and that we are not bound for very long at least by a solicitor's opinion if it is contrary to the intent of the Congress in the interpretation of the law.

Accordingly, a few weeks after that, the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation started hearings early in 1946 on a bill which was to remedy this matter. It has been said here by several that long and extensive hearings have been held on, if not this particular bill, similar bills. I have in my hand here the hearings held on the subject matter

of this measure in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is a very highly technical matter. I now hold in my hands the hearings held by the present Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands of the Eightieth Congress. So, you see, gentlemen, your Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation has heard reams of hearings and weeks of testimony by experts on this matter. It is a difficult and highly technical subject.

Let me go into it just a bit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On page 9 of the bill, lines 13 to 17, there is reference made that power revenues may include no more than one-fifth of the revenues derived. Will the gentleman explain what that means?

Mr. MURDOCK. That refers to one-fifth of the revenue derived as interest being used to retire the capital investment for irrigation. The crux of this question and one of the chief points in this matter is this: Shall interest be paid on Government investments in commercial power facilities in these Government plants? What disposition shall be made of such interest moneys? My colleague from New Mexico said a moment ago that everyone on the committee now, and formerly, too, felt and do feel that wherever the Government invests money in a commercial power plant in connection with reclamation, and that power is sold for commercial use to municipalities or anyone else, that interest should be paid on that money. This bill so provides for interest. In this bill we are changing the rate from 3 percent, which is written in the present law, to 2½ percent. But this measure provides that that money, the 2½ percent, shall go into the Treasury as rent or payment for the use of money. However, in certain cases the Secretary may determine that in order to make a project feasible it is going to have to have a little extra help, and he may take as much as one-half of 1 percent, or one-fifth of this interest money, and not pay it into the Treasury as interest, but apply it on the reduction of capital investment on the irrigation costs which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Gentlemen, let me point out that the National Reclamation Association, by resolution for two different years, has called upon us to clarify this legislation, because they said the Solicitor's opinion, which had now become law, was contrary to the intent of Congress. Let me also point out that at the meeting of the same National Reclamation Association in Phoenix, Ariz., last October—and I am proud to say that several Members of the House were in attendance there—this matter came up, and by unanimous consent of that large organization, representing 17 Western States, the association went on record as endorsing this Rockwell bill in its present form. Now, in view of the fact that twice before they had called for something like this, and last Octo-

ber the same organization unanimously approved this form of a bill, it seems to me, gentlemen, that that ought to go far to convince us that we should adopt a measure like this, which is rather intricate for most of us to understand and very, very difficult to explain briefly, but is regarded as solving our problem, I want to give their request and later endorsement all the emphasis I possibly can.

Let me read the resolution that was adopted last year by the National Reclamation Association. Mind you, do not get confused by the name. The National Reclamation Association is a private organization of water users and is not the same as the United States Reclamation Bureau. This is their latest resolution:

Whereas the National Reclamation Association at its fourteenth annual meeting held in 1945 adopted in its resolution No. 1 an expression of its position adverse to the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior respecting the application of power revenues in fixing the power rates on reclamation projects and affirmed its position as to the intent and application of the 1939 Reclamation Act; and

Whereas the National Reclamation Association at its fifteenth annual meeting held in 1946 reiterated by resolution No. 13 the position theretofore taken with respect to these matters and authorized the president of the association to appoint a committee to confer with the Secretary of the Interior the Bureau of Reclamation, the Members of the United States Senate and of the House of Representatives, and interested citizens; and

Whereas following extensive conferences and hearings before the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives there has been reported out, with amendments, a bill (H. R. 2873) which, in the judgment of the committee and of others who have closely analyzed it, fulfills the purposes sought to be accomplished by said resolutions hereinbefore described, and which contains additional beneficial provisions tending to promote the feasibility of Federal reclamation projects and to relieve water users on existing projects from costs attributable to purposes other than irrigation or municipal water supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this association hereby expresses its satisfaction with H. R. 2873 as reported with amendments by the Public Lands Committee of the House of Representatives and urges its prompt passage by that body and by the Senate and its approval by the President of the United States.

The National Reclamation Association is made up of farmers, water users, and has some of the best technical experts in the country, who know more about irrigation, its purposes, and its value, I think, than any other group inside the Congress or out. After all these hearings before the House committee in which they took part they have placed their stamp of approval on this bill in its present form. For that reason, I hope we can pass the bill without amendment.

In 1945 I promised certain gentlemen now right in front of me that I would do my best as chairman of the committee in the Seventy-ninth Congress to get action taken by that proper legislative committee of the House to clarify this matter. While this bill does not satisfy me entirely, it is a compromise, it is the best we can get, and I believe we ought to adopt it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I want to compliment the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] on the fine work he did as chairman of this committee last year. It was certainly through no lack of desire on his part that we did not have his bill presented last year. I am with him in the hope that we can carry it at this time.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I notice that section 9 provides that the Secretary may make findings as to the nonreimbursable items. The one I am interested in is the one with reference to salinity control. In my area there are 450,000 acres of land in the Sacramento-San Joaquin delta which are subject to the encroachment of salt water. Can the gentleman inform us what are the bases of his findings regarding how much should be nonreimbursable for that particular purpose?

Mr. MURDOCK. I cannot be as specific as that, as that is a special problem and varies with conditions on each project that has it.

I am heartily in favor of the provisions here written which were condemned a little while ago by a member of the Committee on Rules. When we build a great multiple-purpose dam on our western rivers and when we attempt to have a great reclamation project, there are other things that must be considered besides irrigation and power, for instance, salinity control as in the great Central Valley of California. If we cannot stop the encroachment of salt water in that area, which is in your district, sir, around the Great Bay, hundreds of thousands of acres of land which used to be productive will be ruined. It is just about as important that we build a dam like Shasta Dam to furnish fresh water to keep back salt water and provide for salinity control as to supply it to be used for irrigation.

In addition to that, there are other benefits to accompany reclamation. I mean recreation on lakes and rivers in our western part of the country where we have so little water that the sight of a cupful of it is delightful to the eye. We would like to have fish. The Fish and Game Protective Association of Arizona is in constant touch with me, calling my attention to the fact that thousands and thousands of citizens in Arizona want some place to go boating, some place to go fishing. These things are important and of such value that you cannot figure the money worth exactly, but they have great value, and the farmers in that irrigation district should not be called upon to pay for these benefits to get reclamation.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. May I first commend my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, for his splendid statement. But

it occurs to me that he might have said to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that the extent of the allocation that the Secretary of the Interior might make for salinity control is wholly an engineering problem and, of course, the Secretary will refer that matter to a board of engineers. I might say to the gentleman from California that there are several checks upon size of the allocation that might be made by the Secretary of the Interior; in the first place the question of feasibility must be submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. Of course the budget then will call upon other interested departments of Government for advice as to the computation of the Secretary. In addition to that, of course, when the Bureau of the Budget requests an appropriation for that particular project, the Committee on Appropriations will then look into the various elements of feasibility and the amounts allocated. So it seems to me there are many checks on the discretion of the Secretary and no one can say just how much is going to be allocated for salinity control because the engineers themselves will have to make a detailed study and only after they make their report will the Secretary arrive at the amount to be charged against salinity control.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Wyoming has put it just exactly right. All of these things are taken into consideration exactly as the formula for flood control has been studied by the engineers. Heretofore, for instance, when we built Hoover Dam, the cost of the whole thing was considered and the flood-control part was estimated at \$25,000,000 and that amount was thought to be about right for flood control. Therefore that part of the cost was put in a special category by itself. The same thing will apply to silt control, salinity control, fish and wildlife protection, and recreational facilities. Certain things will be made nonreimbursable so that our farmers will not have to pay for them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May I compliment the gentleman for his explanation of these provisions of law. May I also point out to you that in addition to the 450,000 acres of very rich peat land along the upper reaches of the San Francisco Bay, there are many industrial plants and twice in the last 25 years they have had serious encroachments there which almost compelled them to shut up their plants, the steel mills, chemical plants, and canneries and so forth. This will have a salutary effect in keeping these plants open throughout the entire year.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I rise to inquire about that clause on page 7: "The Secretary may make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized." It seems to me that is going very far afield and opens the door to unknown possibilities. Not only to projects that will be authorized as to engineering data that may be

available, but as to all of the projects that have heretofore been authorized, means that you are on a fishing expedition to justify an unjustifiable project. I would like to have the gentleman's explanation of that provision.

Mr. MURDOCK. As the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] indicated a moment ago, such findings will be subject to engineering checks on those projects the same as on any projects which may hereafter be authorized. Some of these benefits which the bill makes nonreimbursable are so needed I would not deny existing projects of them after all have been carefully checked.

Mr. Chairman, may I, in closing, say this: The great cause of reclamation has been harmed or has been slowed down because of the controversy over the Solicitor's ruling in 1944 on the act of 1939. I believe that this measure will clarify it and put it on a sound business basis so that we can go forward at once with the work of reclamation which the country now needs. Failure to pass a proper bill will continue the existing confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] has again expired.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2873, now under consideration, is a bill to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This bill is the result of extended hearings held over a long period of time. It was unanimously reported by the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] is chairman, to the full Committee on Public Lands, and in turn was unanimously reported by the full committee to this House after mature consideration. Differences of opinion in the committee which had been evident for some time have been composed in a satisfactory manner. Your committee believes that the bill here presented is one which will benefit the whole Nation and particularly those States depending upon irrigation, conservation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power.

The National Reclamation Association at its sixteenth annual convention held in Phoenix, Ariz., in October 1947, gave unanimous approval to the bill in its present form.

As reported, the bill will permit the inclusion of recreation, salinity control and silt control, and the allocation of costs of proposed Federal reclamation projects. It will reduce the rate of interest required to be returned on the power investment from 3 to 2½ percent per annum.

The bill settles the long-standing controversy over application of interest rate on the power investment by providing that not more than one-fifth of the revenue derived from the interest component of power rates may be applied on irrigation costs chargeable to power.

The enactment of this legislation will not cost the Federal Treasury one penny of the taxpayer's money. On the contrary, at the interest rate established by the bill, the Federal Government will receive a greater amount of interest than it



costs the Government to otherwise borrow money.

This bill would insure the completion of the great Central Valley project, which is as large as the entire State of Michigan. In other words, the Central Valley is as large as the States of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and one-half of the State of Rhode Island combined. It would also make feasible smaller projects which would otherwise be nonfeasible. The enactment of this bill will add billions of dollars of wealth from which the Federal Treasury will benefit.

The tremendous demand for power during the past year has necessitated the use of more than 40,000,000 barrels of oil for the production of electric energy, a large part of which could and should have been provided by hydroelectric power plants. This demand is increasing. Our national petroleum resources are limited, and every barrel of oil taken from the ground is gone forever. It is a woeful waste of irreplaceable oil to use it for manufacturing electricity in areas where hydroelectric power can be developed. Hydroelectric power is inexhaustible. Every reclamation, conservation, and irrigation project developing hydroelectric power, whether privately or publicly owned, builds our national peacetime economy just that much stronger and strengthens our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, money advanced for irrigation and conservation projects from which hydroelectric power can be developed is not a Government subsidy. It is an investment in the security of America. Every dollar must be repaid.

Mr. Chairman, there is no honest objection to the development of hydroelectric power by private enterprise. On the other hand, private power interests have no right to interfere with great hydroelectric power projects beyond their financial scope, such projects as the Tennessee Valley Authority, Hoover Dam on the Colorado River, Grand Coulee and Bonneville on the Columbia River, the Shasta Dam in the great Central Valley project, or with infant multiple projects which are made economically feasible by Government participation which will continue as they have in the past to be self-liquidating. Without these large publicly owned hydroelectric projects to which I have referred we would have been totally unable to produce the aluminum for the air fleets of World War II, one-third of which aluminum was produced from the power furnished by the Columbia River projects alone.

This is forward-looking, constructive legislation and should be passed by this House without changing its text, intent, or purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back 6 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The question I want to ask is along the line of that asked

by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and relates to the proviso on page 7, beginning in line 5, which authorizes the Secretary to make a new analysis of the projects heretofore authorized. The question I wish to propound is whether new projects which are yet to be authorized will have the privilege of the 78-year repayment base period? Will these projects, which are going to be retroactively analyzed, also have that same benefit of extending their period of repayment from the present allowable of 40 years to 78 years?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I may say to the gentleman there is no limit of 40 years at the present time. The life of the project is the limit at the present time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is not to exceed 40 years, is it not?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. That particular section refers to the power project, and as to power projects under the present law there is no limit. The practice of the Department has been to limit them to 40 or 50 years, but it may extend them beyond 50 years, subject, of course, to the approval of Congress, which appropriates the money. As to these projects, we may go back, even under present law, and revalue the projects and come to the Congress and ask for an additional period of time. So it makes no difference either way by this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me be clear in my understanding. At the present time the Central Valley water project in California is amortized on a 40-year basis.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is the irrigation project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Irrigation and power, both.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As to the power project, there is no limitation, so far as the law is concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Can they obtain the same benefits, that is, change from a 40-year basis to a 78-year basis, that the new projects may enjoy?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, by going back and asking Congress again to authorize. All of these projects have to be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman is confused. The gentleman from New Mexico is absolutely correct. Under the present law there is no limit. It is merely limited to the useful life of the project. I have been informed a matter of only a few weeks ago a power project was authorized by the Secretary of the Interior on a pay-out of 69 years. So this matter of 40 years does not enter into it. The 40 years applies to the irrigation farmer, not to the power end of it. There is no limitation to the power pay-out at the present time, except insofar as the contracts made with the department set a limit.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why a matter so simple can be made so difficult to understand. The matter before us is very, very simple indeed if we only bear in mind two things.

In every multiple-power project the money invested by the Government is di-

vided into two large sections. One is flood control, which is nonreimbursable. The other section is the portion of the investment which is reimbursable. That portion of the investment which is reimbursable is divided into three blocks. The first block is the power investment which power has to reimburse. It has to charge enough to pay back the investment to the reclamation fund or the Government. The second block is that portion of the irrigation costs which are assigned to the irrigators to pay and they have to pay those through their operations in a period of not to exceed 40 or 50 years. The third block is a small block, which is that portion of the irrigator's costs which the irrigators cannot reimburse and which are assigned to the power project to reimburse.

Under the present law it is required by the present practice of the Bureau of Reclamation that the power investment shall be reimbursed to the Government as principal plus 3 percent interest, but the 3 percent interest is used in some cases to aid in the third block of costs which are assigned to power but which go to irrigation and which the irrigators cannot pay.

The thing that brought all this controversy about is that the Solicitor back in 1944 ruled, as to power, that there was no limit within which the power investment need be paid, but that so long as power returned the principal within the useful life of the project, that was all that was necessary, and that in returning that principal, 3 percent interest should be credited to the principal, not as interest, and naturally, the National Reclamation Association and other people began to object.

In my opinion, they have made a mountain out of a molehill and they have made a mountain out of a molehill because they had a certain purpose in doing that. The National Reclamation Association is the one that through all their conventions and through all the sessions of Congress has been raising this question and making, as I say, a mountain out of a molehill. Why? Because the National Reclamation Association is composed of two classes of people: One, the people who already have projects built or have projects under construction and who, being organized, are members of the National Reclamation Association; second, people who are interested in reclamation because they are in sympathy with the power people who are interested in power. They are the people who put up the money for the association and they are the people who have the greatest voice in the National Reclamation Association. Sure, there are others of us who belong to it, but our voice is weak, because we are not organized. Our projects have not been authorized.

It is perfectly natural that those who already have their projects built or under construction should object to other projects being built on their same streams, if they can possibly prevent it; and just as naturally the power lobby is interested in seeing to it that as little public power as possible is provided at low rates of interest. So, their interests coincide and naturally the National Reclamation As-

sociation has been, in session after session, in and out of season, talking about this interest component, and they have convinced the fine gentlemen who head the Appropriations Committee and they have convinced many other Members of Congress that the Solicitor's opinion is a real danger to us. Well, maybe so; I do not know. But I do know that up until now that provision of the Solicitor's opinion which says that the interest component, the 3 percent interest, may be credited to the principal and to the reimbursing of the principal, has not been followed, and the Bureau of Reclamation has at all times said that they are not going to follow it. That is why I say that this thing is a mountain made out of a molehill.

Mr. Sawyer, of the National Reclamation Association, testified before the committee and virtually admitted that that was the fact; that the Bureau of Reclamation was not following the Solicitor's opinion, but he said:

That opinion of the Solicitor creates a climate in which appropriations are made and very strong representations have been made by influential members of the Appropriations Committee that they do not like that climate—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. FERNANDEZ—

They would like to see it changed. They come from the portion of the country that has the voting strength. It is on the tolerance of these men—

That is, the Appropriations Committee men—

as I have said several times, that reclamation exists at all.

It is a climate created by the Solicitor's opinion that we are trying to correct by this bill. As far as I am concerned, and that is why I can talk about this bill without any animosity whatever, I do not care whether this bill is passed or whether it is not passed, because I think the present law under the administration of the Bureau of Reclamation and its present policies is good. This bill only makes it certain that the present policies will be followed, so far as power investment is concerned.

One of those gentlemen from the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Jones, appeared before our committee. I congratulate Mr. Jones, a former Congressman from Ohio, because he was very frank with our committee. He said he wanted this 3 percent paid and not used to aid irrigation costs. He said he did not care whether it was paid to the reclamation fund or the Treasury, but he wanted it paid. He was frank in telling the committee what he thought, which reflected the thinking of the National Reclamation Association. I quote:

Mr. JONES. Therefore, by the policy of the present law, the reclamation program is being broken because they are breaking the market for the sale of power at higher generation cost projects.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Pardon me, Mr. Jones. I did not quite understand what you mean

by the expression "breaking the market for power." Would you mind explaining that?

Mr. JONES. Well, as a matter of fact, sir, to emphasize the point, you will find in last year's hearings of the Interior Department appropriation bill, where a private utility purchased all of the power at Shasta Dam, and it can produce it at 5 mills plus a kilowatt-hour, yet it is buying power at an average rate of about 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, the top rating being 3.4, which is 3.3 mills less than the private utility can generate that power with the tax component in its facilities.

Therefore, I say that the Reclamation Bureau is breaking the market. It should be able to get the full amount that the private power company would pay, if it were using its own facilities, five point plus a kilowatt-hour.

Do you understand what I mean?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. In other words, in simple language, it just means we are not selling power for enough money.

Mr. JONES. For what it would take private utilities to generate it, at their own plant, and pay the taxes according to the laws of the States.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You want to charge more?

Mr. JONES. My point is you cannot have your cake and eat it, too. If power is to help pay out these projects, power should be used for this purpose. Instead of making a promise on the one hand to get the great transmission and generating projects to pay out the construction costs and then break the market of the power by underselling the market.

That is plain speaking, and that is what is before us.

As I said, we have three blocks of investments here. If the 3 percent is used to assist in paying that little block of irrigation costs that the irrigator cannot pay, then they can sell power a little bit cheaper. If, as the Solicitor's opinion says, the investment for power can be paid by the 3 percent being credited to principal, then they can sell power still cheaper. Under this bill they cannot do that. They cannot sell power and use the 3 percent to pay for the principal of the power investment. They cannot use the 3 percent to pay for the help that the irrigators get, except for the small one-fifth portion of the interest.

Because of that, I say that this bill simply carries forward what the Bureau of Reclamation has been doing, with the one single, solitary exception of that 3 percent which the irrigators used to get and which they will not get in the future if this bill is passed. To the extent of the other four-fifths, additional power rates will be necessary to assist the irrigators on the proportion of their cost assigned to power.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am referring to the provisions on page 9 of the bill where the matter which the gentleman is talking about is covered. As I understand it, one-fifth of the interest component can be turned into the irrigation project.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. One-fifth of the interest component can be credited toward paying the debt of the irrigators, which they are not able to pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then it reads as follows:

In addition to any and all sums otherwise assigned for such purpose from power revenues.

Will the gentleman please explain to the Members just on what basis the revenues from the power features of the project are turned over to the irrigators? What is the limit? What principles are involved?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This is the principle involved: Under the reclamation law, the Congress realized that there were projects on which the irrigators could not pay in full for the advantages that they get. So, under the irrigation law, they provided that the Secretary may allocate some of those costs that otherwise would have to be paid by the irrigators to the power project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; but the point is that here we have apparently granted an unlimited discretion to just turn over power revenues to the irrigators. What I want to know is what is the principle involved? We are building a big dam on the American River—the Folsom Dam—that will be authorized here very soon and part of that money from the power revenues is going to the irrigators.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is to assist the irrigators.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Are there not some principles that the Secretary applies to determine what portion of the power revenues should be turned over to the irrigation people?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes, of course.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What are they?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This is the principle: He requires the irrigators to pay to the limit of their ability. Then what they cannot pay he assigns to power, provided power can pay and still charge reasonable rates, and provided the Congress approves it. He must report to the Congress how much he does so allocate to power. If the gentleman does not agree with that principle, of course, that is another matter. There are some of us who are not in agreement with it and some of us who are.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I am thoroughly in agreement with it. What I want to know from the gentleman is just how he does arrive at the amount of power revenues that should be turned over. Does it depend on the rate structure? Does it depend on how much the irrigators need, or any other factors? What is the principle that the Secretary invokes to make the allocation?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It depends on what the Congress says can be turned over to them. He figures out the costs and amounts which can be recovered from power and brings it to Congress. It depends on the Congress and it depends on the cost.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will it vary from project to project?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Oh, necessarily it has to vary from project to project. Each project must stand on its own feet.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Secretary have the absolute power to determine at what rate the water prices should be fixed? In other words, what is too much to pay for water?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I can yield any further. I



think I have answered the question so far as I as a Member of Congress can answer it. If you want some detailed explanation of just how he goes about that, I presume that you would have to ask him about it. I am not an engineer; I am not an accountant; and I do not have much experience so far as that aspect of these projects is concerned. I wish I had more. I am sorry I cannot help the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If I may ask the gentleman one more question. For instance, in the area that I referred to, would the rates that the Reclamation Bureau gives to the water users compare with the rates by local irrigation districts?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. You mean in setting the rates or the price that should be paid for power?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, in setting the rates that they should charge for water. What would determine how much irrigators have to pay for water?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Oh, we are getting into deep water here. I cannot tell you that. I am not an engineer or an accountant.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a matter of business and is not an engineering matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. If so, I am sure the gentleman can figure it out for himself. I cannot even undertake to tell you how my own home projects in New Mexico are being figured. That is up to these experts and up to the Congress when they bring the figures before the Congress.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am so happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I would like to know the feeling of the committee on the principle involved in sections 8 and 9 on page 6 that if the proposed construction is found to be feasible then the new project shall be deemed to be authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary. Is it the idea of the committee to turn this over to the Secretary without reference to Congress?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No, that just follows the present law, with reference to small projects. They do that if they find they are feasible, provided Congress approves by appropriating the money. But there are no more small projects and nearly every project now comes to the Congress for authorization as well as appropriations.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. What in this act forces it to come before the Congress?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Only Congress can vote the necessary appropriations. That language is exactly the same as the old law. There is no difference in that language.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the Solicitor's opinion, I think it would be proper to read from that opinion because I have heard some people say that the Solicitor's opinion is misinterpreted by some of us in Congress.

When we have said that the Solicitor's opinion held that the power investment could be paid by applying the 3 percent interest to the principal rather than collecting the interest in addition, some people have said that we misinterpreted him. I want to read into the RECORD exactly what he said. In taking up the question, he first said:

One view of the law is that the allocations report must be predicated on estimates of revenues sufficient to return to the United States that portion of the reimbursable costs properly chargeable to power and the other portions of the reimbursable costs that are to be met by power revenues, and, in addition, interest at 3 percent per annum on what is described in section 9 (c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 as "an appropriate share of the construction investment."

The other principal view is that, even though power rates are to be fixed on a basis that includes as a part of the rate base interest on that portion of the costs properly chargeable to power, it is only necessary, insofar as showing full reimbursability of the project is concerned, to show a return within an agreed period of amortization of the full amount of the project costs which are allocated to be returned from power revenues.

In answering these questions, he said:

I believe that a proper interpretation of section 9 of the Reclamation Act of 1939 and the Hayden-O'Mahoney amendment to the Department's Appropriation Act of 1939 require that the minimum rate schedule be such as to produce revenues sufficient only to meet, in addition to the return for operation and maintenance cost, an amount equal to 3 percent of the power construction costs with the proviso that, if total revenues thus produced are insufficient to repay all costs allocated to power to be repaid by power revenues, "other fixed charges" must be included in the rate schedule to produce revenues sufficient to repay such costs.

That certainly holds that the 3 percent interest may be used to repay the total investment in the power plant. With that interpretation of the law none of us agreed; and, though the Bureau of Reclamation never has followed it insofar as the power investment is concerned, it does create a cloud. This bill, if it does nothing else, corrects that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] has again expired.

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, this is not a sectional issue. It is a national issue. It affects not only the 17 Western States that are directly affected in the creation of new wealth, but it affects the Nation as a whole. We are 48 States but one Nation. The time has come that we should all realize that wealth-creating projects and wealth-saving projects should be given preference to every other, and it is not boondoggling, even though there may be some boondoggling in States very close to us.

The Federal Government realized the value of its vast resources. It realized that there were in the Western States large bodies of land that could be reclaimed by irrigation. Then, a little later on there developed another industry that came along which we did not see at the time we started in with reclamation. That was hydroelectric power.

Hydroelectric power especially affects the Nation just as much as irrigation.

In my own State we are more interested in hydroelectric power than we are in irrigation, although we are interested in both. The REA is working in my State and it needs more and cheaper electricity if it can get it. Unfortunately there are some who would like to have us continue in darkness but we refuse to stay there. We are going to have plenty of light but up to date only 10 percent of the farmers of my State have been able to get electricity in their homes.

Now that the war is over, however, we are in hopes that this bill will pass and within a short time we will have electrical energy not only for light but for power for all the farmers of North Dakota. And I can assure you that that is also the longing and the desire of all farmers in all of the Missouri River Valley States.

Then comes another question with which this program and this bill are directly connected—the national welfare and the national security. I have before me a statement by Mr. Forrestal about synthetic oil and I shall just read a few sentences from it. Secretary of Defense Forrestal stated that the United States is so short of oil that if war came tomorrow we would need 2,000,000 barrels a day more than the Nation can produce. Get that! Then, testifying on the impact of the oil shortage on national defense before a House Armed Services Subcommittee, Mr. Forrestal urged the United States to set up immediately a synthetic-oil industry at the cost of \$8,000,000,000.

I am sure my friend from Virginia would not say that that was boondoggling. Oil can be made synthetically from coal, natural gas, and oil shale. In addition I want to save at least part of the oil used in producing electrical energy and thereby save part of that \$8,000,000,000 that Mr. Forrestal suggests. Let us develop hydroelectric power to do part of the work that this oil would do.

The chairman of our Public Lands Committee has told you on several occasions that we are now using in the neighborhood of 40,000,000 barrels of oil a year to create electrical energy and to do what this wasted water would do if put to useful work; water which runs unchallenged to the ocean when it ought to be harnessed and made to produce electricity and which could be used over and over again as long as the rains came from the heavens. We should use the water in place of burning up the oil we need so badly at a time when we are creating the largest air force in the world. We will need many times the oil we can produce today to keep those planes up in the air in case of war.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a national issue, an issue confined not to the 17 Western States but which affects the entire Nation. Let us go a little further and see some of the results that have come from reclamation. Reclamation has already added billions and billions of dollars of new wealth. The Government collects income taxes on that new wealth. In the higher brackets it takes as much as 85½ percent of that

new wealth. That means a reduction in the taxes of this Nation, a load taken off of all the people. If this bill passes, it will materially facilitate and increase the production of this new wealth.

Why let the water go unchallenged to the ocean, bringing death and destruction not only to human beings, but destruction to property and to livestock as well? Let us harness the water and use it instead of letting it go unchallenged to destroy people down on the lower reaches of our large rivers such as the Mississippi, the Columbia, and so on.

In the last war, and the evidence is ample before our committee—it is in the hearings and if you have any doubt about what I say read the hearings—millions upon millions of dollars were saved to the Federal Government because of the new hydroelectric power plants that had been created, for they made possible the vast production of aluminum and other instrumentalities used in the war.

I am proud of the performance of these 17 Western States that had the vision—and of the eastern people too who had the vision—to see that reclamation was needed and to develop these new sources of electrical power and who had the good sense to finance it as well as use it for the needs of our Nation.

Now, something has been said as to the purpose of this bill. I just want to call your attention very briefly to a request that the Appropriations Committee made at the time one of these appropriation bills for the Reclamation Bureau was up for consideration.

Here is the statement:

In making certain appropriations in this bill from the general fund for reclamation projects the conferees do so with the recommendation that new legislation shall be passed at the earliest opportunity providing for the disposal of the interest collected—

That is, the interest component—

on sums invested in power and municipal water features on reclamation projects and with the understanding that interest heretofore or hereafter collected on such investments in power or municipal water features of any such reclamation project constructed or operated under the authority of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 shall not be allocated during the fiscal year 1948.

Our committee had that mandate. After many weeks of meetings and after much diversity of opinion as my able chairman the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rockwell] has pointed out to you, there were differences of opinion. Those differences of opinion were not only in the Bureau of Reclamation and in our committee. There was a difference of opinion in the 17 Western States. There was a difference of opinion among many people outside of those 17 States as to just what should be done and what was for the best interest of the Nation as a whole as well as for the 17 States.

We finally compromised after many weeks. We had to give and we had to take. When the bill was finally reported it was reported unanimously. All of the members of the committee were present when it was reported out. There was no question left. We were all agreed we did not get all we wanted. I did not get all I wanted and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Rockwell] did not get

everything he wanted for his bill. But we reached a compromise.

What was the compromise? Under the Solicitor's opinion—and I think the Bureau was correct, we would not want them to go against the Solicitor's opinion—the law was construed that this 3 percent could go into the irrigation project to help irrigation and it was further held that the time was unlimited except as to the life of the project. There is some doubt even whether it was limited to the life of the project. There was nothing said in the Solicitor's opinion as to how the principal should be paid back. His conclusion was that if you kept paying the 3 percent each year on a project you were doing your full duty and that was all that was required.

We compromised. The first compromise was that the interest rate was lowered from 3 to 2½ percent. Two percent was to go into the Treasury earmarked for reclamation. There was no dispute about that. I wanted all to go for the project, but my friends on the committee outnumbered me, although I did have some considerable support there for my position. Two percent goes now into the project and only one-half percent goes to the particular irrigation project for irrigation use to help the farmers. That is only one-half percent out of 2½ percent, whereas before we got the whole 3. That was a considerable concession.

However, in order to make these smaller financially sound projects feasible, I wish my friend from Virginia would hear those words "sound projects" because any one project is sound that pays out in the end with 2½ percent interest—we had to extend the life within which these payments were made from what was proposed both in my bill and in the Rockwell bill from 67 years to 78 years. This was necessary to bring about the results that we in our States need. But we do not live for our own States alone. If we are here legislating for the Nation we ought to be big enough to realize this Nation is one Nation. We cannot bear that in mind too many times. Sectionalism has no business in national legislation.

Now then, on this question—it was a debatable question and I am not saying which side was right or wrong—it was necessary to meet on some happy hunting ground, in the middle somewhere. So, we agreed that if the time was extended to 78 years we would consent that the 2 percent should go into the Treasury, earmarked for general reclamation, and that Congress should reappropriate and allow projects from time to time out of that particular money, that particular fund.

Now, I have no quarrel with anybody. That is the suggestion I have to make, and I wish to say, however, that the Committee on Rules should not be asked to write the laws. Their business is to bring out rules. The different committees that have all the information before them write the laws, and there is good reason why the Committee on Rules should not attempt to write laws, for the reason that they have not heard the evidence. They do not know what it is about.

It has been wisely said by myself and others that the person who does not know and remembers that he does not know is not dangerous to society or to national defense, but the person who does not know that he does not know and thinks he knows becomes dangerous to society and to national defense alike. So, let us remember that no person is all-wise in our body here; that we all are limited in time and energy and that we must not try to run the whole show; that we must limit ourselves to the subjects that we have heard fully discussed and have full knowledge of. That is one reason I believe that if you go amending this bill you will change the very purpose, the very object of our compromise, and I, for one, shall vote to recommit it if any such attempt is made here in this House.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman that I do not know how the principal is to be repaid on the reimbursable projects? Would the gentleman kindly explain?

Mr. LEMKE. They are to be repaid now within the life of the project; that is, they are divided in two. As to irrigation the principal must be repaid within 40 years or such further extension as Congress may allow without interest. On the power side, under this bill, it will have to be repaid within 78 years with interest at 2½ percent on unpaid balances, or sooner, if the life of the project does not run and does not stand up for 78 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I ask the gentleman an additional question? Is this principal repaid at a uniform rate or just as the Secretary of the Interior wishes it should be repaid?

Mr. LEMKE. It is paid back at a uniform rate, and it is paid back under contract made by the various projects with the Department of the Interior, and under that contract it is flexible. There may be certain different conditions. For instance, the present law says from the time that the project gets into operation, which may take 10 years from the time the contract is made. Then when the payments begin to run they are fixed and uniform. I know that from my own experience with irrigation in my own State. When we had the drought, and they were not able to pay, they got an extension from Congress.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman, and the gentleman from Florida for his extension of time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to ask a question regarding that part of the bill on page 10 beginning with line 4:

Nothing in this subsection shall be applicable to provisions in existing contracts, made pursuant to law.



On page 7 you give the Secretary the right to make a reanalysis of projects which have been heretofore authorized, but according to my understanding you, in this section, take away the right for any readjustment of rates to give existing projects the same beneficial right of repayment that you are now giving future projects.

Mr. LEMKE. Let me say to the gentleman that there are certain inequities, and so forth, that can be readjusted without further action by Congress. However, there are some of these projects that have been created by special act of Congress, like the Hoover Dam and others. If they wish to come under the similar provisions, I, for one, shall support them, unless they continue to obstruct this legislation and pull everybody down to their own situation. I do not believe that is necessary to gain their object. But, I know that the Hoover Dam and some other projects need help.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I think what the gentleman from California has in mind is, say, for the Central Valley Authority, that their present pay-out period is approximately 50 years. I think his query is directed to this point. If this bill is passed, can they renegotiate to extend the pay-out period to 78 years?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Providing it is necessary.

Mr. LEMKE. I am satisfied they can.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Without additional legislation, or with it?

Mr. LEMKE. With additional legislation. They can extend it from the time it was started up to 78 years. I am satisfied that can be done by Congress if they desire it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the contract between the Central Valley Authority and the farmers of the area is now on a 39-year basis?

Mr. LEMKE. It may be necessary that you come and ask Congress to give the same privileges to you and the Hoover Dam and other similar projects that this bill has. I, for one, shall be glad to join hands with you when that time comes. You cannot cover everything in one bill. I think the gentleman realizes that.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In regard to the renegotiation of the Hoover Dam and the Central Valley projects, is that the attitude of the committee that is opposing this bill?

Mr. LEMKE. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is expressing his own opinion. Does he know what the opinion of the committee is?

Mr. LEMKE. I am expressing the opinion of a considerable number, if not the majority of the committee, when I say that I am satisfied that, if this bill passes, similar legislation for their proj-

ects and similar terms will be very seriously and gratefully received.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. I can say for the benefit of my California colleague, or colleagues [Mr. McDONOUGH], and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], also the gentleman from California [Mr. POUSSON], that I concur with the gentleman from North Dakota and, as chairman of the committee, I will support legislation to extend the amortization period of the Colorado River to the full length of time provided for in the bill now pending before this House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he would extend that same project to the Central Valley water project in case it was necessary?

Mr. WELCH. In case of necessity, absolutely.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for giving me this 5 minutes. I was reluctant to ask the members of the majority to give me 5 minutes because I know many members of the committee desire to discuss this very important bill.

Those who do not live out in the western part of the country do not really understand how vital water, backed up behind dams, is to our part of the country. We have no rain from roughly the 1st of April until the middle of November. By building these dams, we store the water necessary to give our lands water during the growing season.

To show you the importance of water and irrigation, I can cite you a very simple illustration. This is in figures as of before the war.

In my county bare land, without irrigation, was worth roughly \$50 an acre. In the sixties, seventies, and eighties, that land raised very excellent grain, especially barley and wheat. With water on that land so that it would raise fruit, nuts, and vegetables which it does raise now, including thousands and thousands of tons of grapes, it went from \$250 an acre to \$1,000 an acre. In other words, the price rose from 5 to over 10 times in value due to the fact that we have irrigation.

I want to direct my attention to the matter contained in the provisions of the bill on page 9 which provides that there may be returned from the net power revenues one-fifth of the revenues derived from the interest component of power rates in addition to any and all other sums otherwise assigned for such purpose from power revenues. To me that is a very broad provision. What I am thinking about is this: It seems to give unlimited discretion to the Secretary of the Interior to turn over from the power revenues all of the money that he cares to to the irrigationists. I have thousands of irrigationists in my district,

and I want them to get help from power revenues. But I likewise have a great many people who are going to buy this public electric power. The Sacramento Municipal Utility District which was just organized 2 years ago serves over 200,000 people. There are 60,000 meters in the district. We will be the first big customer for the hydroelectric power generated in the Central Valley project at the Shasta Dam. The power users whose power bills are going to pay for the power features of this dam plus some extra money to the irrigationists should not lose the benefit of the public ownership in that project and they will lose these benefits if there is too much of a diversion to the irrigationists.

You must remember that in the Central Valley of California there are dozens and dozens of independent local irrigation districts. In the very area that I represent there are probably 10 different districts. The ranchers using the water developed by these districts raised all the money that they required to develop their water and, in some instances, also electric power. They did not get one dollar from the Government. They got no help from anybody. They paid the interest on their bonds at rates ranging from 4 percent to 6 percent. They bonded themselves for 40 years and are gradually paying back the bonds dollar for dollar.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. May I say to my colleague from California that of course he recognizes the fact these power projects are wholly incidental to reclamation and that that is the basic authority upon which they were constructed originally. The law properly provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall take such proportion of the revenues from power as will make it possible to construct the reclamation end of the project.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that thoroughly, but I do not want the Secretary to go too far and rob the power consumers, who are going to pay for all this, of all of their benefits. There is danger of doing that very thing.

Mr. BARRETT. No, no; there is no danger of doing that because the Secretary of the Interior is limited by economic reasons. He has to sell this power at a very low rate in big blocks and consequently he has to keep that rate low. Therefore a project can only be determined to be feasible, first, if the power can pay for its way and also if it can pay enough so that the farmers can construct their reclamation projects.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I agree with the principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My time is all being taken up by members of the committee, but I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. This bill does not extend in any way the amount which power has to pay in aid of irrigation, but it does limit the amount of interest which may have to be paid.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I understand that thoroughly. That is just what I am afraid of. It does not limit it and the very cheap electricity that our people are looking for may be dissipated by diverting too much to irrigationists and thereby making the electric rate too high. If you get a Secretary of the Interior who wants to ride roughshod over the power consumers, that is what might happen. There ought to be a balance in there somewhere where they could not give too much money away and thus charge the electric consumers who are going to pay for these projects.

Mr. BARRETT. There is no change from the present law. That is the law at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I know, but it has not been applied to my section yet and I am afraid that it could be applied to the detriment of some of my people.

I want to mention one other thing, just to raise the question. We have been talking about this reclamation law and have heretofore thought of its projects as being liquidated over a 40-year span. Often the question comes to my mind, What is going to happen to any particular project when all of the landowners have paid it all out? I understand the original idea of those who drafted the 1902 act was that the landowners would then take it over and operate it; but as far as I know, that has not yet occurred. The reason I mention that is this: I think we ought to lay down this principle, and I have gone so far as to introduce two bills, heretofore, covering the principle, that on intrastate rivers, like we have in California and other States, after the Government acts as banker and furnishes the money to build the projects and upon their completion then the United States should make a contract with the State, providing that the State may be substituted in place of the National Government to administer the project. In the contract providing for this arrangement, they would then provide that the State of California, for instance, would stand in lieu of the landowners who are paying the water bills, and the power consumers, and guarantee to the Federal Government every dollar provided to be repaid to it by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And the administration would be in the hands of the local people. Without any derogatory reference against any member of the Department of the Interior, it is my firm conviction that we would have better administration by local people on the ground making the ultimate decisions than we can have from this far-off administration, 3,000 miles from the scene

where the law is to be administered. Also, the Secretary of the Interior has so many important questions before him that he simply does not have enough hours in the day or enough days in the year to make decisions that he has to make and should make expeditiously. It is not in criticism of their administration, but it is trying to keep in the Department of the Interior the questions involving interstate rivers, and let the United States be the banker to start these intrastate river projects, and then leaving it up to the States who are willing to assume the responsibility of reimbursing the National Government for every dollar they have in the project. This would be more to the benefit of the landowners, would get more rapid decisions, and perhaps would even bring more economical administration. I hope to elaborate more on this proposition in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, what we are discussing this afternoon in the Committee is a specific bill and the wording of that bill. I say that in all seriousness. From noon today up to the present time, I have heard arguments on this floor in favor of the value of reclamation. I have heard discussions of the urgent need of water in the western part of the United States, but I have not heard all of the discussion that I wanted to hear on the specific detail of the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I served for 4 years as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I served very happily on that committee, and was sorry to leave it, but I was one of the Members of the House who was compelled to give up certain committees, under the terms of the Reorganization Act. I served under the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK], and under his predecessor, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. I regret that I cannot now serve as I would like to, under the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], nor on the subcommittee of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

This bill is not new to that committee. This bill has been discussed at length, and the arguments that are embodied on this bill are perhaps still not completely finished.

Laws are made by bringing bills before committees, and eventually and hopefully bringing them out of committees, and then discussing them on the floor, and then, in the wisdom of the Members of the House, sending the bill, if the House so decides, to the other body, in the form in which a majority of the Members want it.

For our discussion today we can divide this bill easily into three parts. There is the question of whether this House wishes to give more power to the Reclamation Bureau, an agency of the Department of the Interior. A great many

Members of this House on both sides of the aisle have gone out in their campaigns in the last 5 years and have spoken very firmly on the subject of wanting to go down to Washington to do what they could to limit the powers of governmental agencies and of departments.

I think as I read the bill that that section beginning on page 4 and extending beyond that to about page 5 or 6 does in some ways extend the powers of the Department of the Interior and those of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Commissioner beyond the powers which these agencies or individuals previously had in their hands. Thus we have a question to decide here: Shall we extend the power of the Bureau of Reclamation in view of the fact that Congress has repeatedly committed itself to limiting the powers of governmental departments? I shall offer no amendment on that point, but I understand a member of the committee intends to offer an amendment to leave the powers of the Commissioner where they exist now and not to extend them; and I, as one Member of the House, will vote for that amendment.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. DEWART. I merely wish to state that the part to which the gentleman referred only extends the power as to the Secretary in determining the feasibility, not in determining the cost of construction or the construction of the dam.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman, and I am glad that is now a part of the Record.

The second part of the bill—and this has been a subject of continuous discussion before the committee—has to do with what we refer to as the interest component. How much of the interest, as you heard this afternoon, shall be applied to reclamation, reduction of reclamation costs, and how much shall be applied to the reduction of power costs? As it appears in this bill, it is, in my opinion, a compromise, and I think the committee has done a commendable job to bring out on the floor a compromise on so highly controversial a subject as the interest component which has been discussed, to my personal knowledge, for 5 years before the present subcommittee and its predecessor committee.

I am not saying that I like this settlement; I am not saying that if I had written it, any more than I think if some members of the committee had written it as they wanted it, it would have been exactly this way; but it is what I call a compromise and it is my intention to support the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], in that compromise which we now find in the bill.

But when you come to the third feature in the bill, which is the extension of time in which a project may be declared feasible, by no stretch of the imagination—to me at least—can that be called a compromise. It has been called a compromise on this floor today. The Bureau of Reclamation either by law or by



custom is accustomed to declaring a project feasible if it can pay itself out in 40 years. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] asked where that originated. I do not know, but I strongly suspect as a man who was formerly on city councils and local governmental agencies that it was adopted from the rule that Government securities, Government bonds, are usually required to run no more than 40 years.

Mr. DEWART. If the gentleman from California will reread that particular section he will find that the 78 years does not apply to feasibility but applies only to the repayment of the money.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am corrected. The bill applies to the ability of the district to repay for power only in this bill, in that length of time; but the All-American Canal, which has been referred to, is compelled by law to repay within 39 years.

The gentleman from Wyoming said this afternoon that a project had been permitted at 69 years. So this is not a compromise. Here is 78 years—beyond anything that we have discussed so far or accepted. I feel very strongly on the fact that 78 years is opening the door wider for projects than this Congress has ever before, or should now, open that door. It does not mean that a project cannot be built if it cannot be paid for in 40 years. It means that Congress must say it is willing it should be built, and not place authorizing power more strongly than it rests now in the hands of an agency of Government.

I understand an amendment will be offered to bring it back to 30 years, and that this amendment will be offered by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations having to do with the Department of the Interior, who is so familiar with this cost problem. I shall certainly support that amendment.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Will the gentleman agree with me that under existing law there is no limitation whatsoever except the useful life of the project and it might well be over 100 years under the law at the present time?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I will agree with the gentleman that under existing law such a thing might be possible, but custom is one deterrent and the unwillingness of a Secretary of the Interior to take upon himself the responsibility of deciding that is another. But if you write into the law that he may have the right on some basis of the life of a project, or the ability of the people to pay, or specify 78 years, then you know full well that the Secretary of any department would think himself authorized to extend the time to the full limit specified and discussed by the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT. May I say to the gentleman that, as I understand it—and I think I am correct—it is true that the average life of the project as estimated is 50 years, but the average pay-out is more than 60 years at the present time.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I do not think that is an argument—to suggest

that we weaken the financial integrity of the project or the financial integrity of the United States.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman is making it much worse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the gentleman and I formerly sat on the same committee. But he misses the entire point of the compromise which he would not have done if he had been on the committee, because I was at one end of that compromise. This bill takes away the 3 percent we get to help irrigation and I get only one-half percent, the other two going to help out projects as authorized by the bill. For giving up that 3 percent or  $2\frac{1}{2}$  percent, in return I get the 78 years, which works out not quite as good as the 2 percent or if it were  $2\frac{1}{2}$  percent to help irrigation. If the gentleman's amendment prevails it will defeat the very purpose of our compromise and it will do the very thing I am sure he would not want done if he were still a member of the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman may call that a compromise, but I do not think giving more than anybody has had before is a compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in hearing the discussion of the two gentlemen from California, both of whom have raised some very important points. The last speaker, it seems to me, has touched on a point that if a certain amendment is adopted will destroy the effect of the whole bill. As the gentleman from North Dakota has pointed out, the whole purpose of this compromise legislation is to preserve the economic feasibility of these great projects. I think it is very important, and I would like to speak to the gentleman from California on the point that he made. If this bill is now amended, reducing the pay-cut period to 50 years, the ultimate effect will be an increase in the power rates. The reason that this compromise has been made by the committee was to see that, first, we would not destroy the economic feasibility of projects and, second, that there would not be any increase in power rates. It is clear what we are talking about in this bill. Some of us feel very strongly about Mr. LEMKE's bill. Some of us felt that the National Reclamation Association had no business to come before this Congress and stir up this issue. We felt we were getting along all right under existing legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, how does the gentleman know that I am going to support the amendment?

Mr. CARROLL. I did not say that the gentleman would. I am talking about the increase in power rates.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman's feeling that the power rates would necessarily be raised is not based on the evidence. That is the gentleman's point, is it not?

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly my point.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. For example, if I may illustrate very briefly the one project with which I am personally very thoroughly familiar, the Reclamation Bureau is charging up against that project 60 percent of the income as the cost of operation when other projects in the same area are not running any more than 21 percent or 27 percent, and that is what is being charged into the cost, and not 50 years or 39 years. My point is that I believe that that is not the only factor in the power rates that you should consider.

Mr. CARROLL. I can assure the gentleman from California that that is the chief factor. As a matter of fact, all of the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior and all his experts said, that if you destroy the rate structure that now exists you will stop irrigation in the West and you will stop some of the great hydroelectric projects in the West. Now, what did he mean by that? That there are certain costs allocated to irrigation. Those have already been set. The pay-out period is 50 years. Many witnesses came before us. They said that they objected to the interest component going to pay off the cost allocated to irrigation. They wanted that money to go into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury Department. We resisted, many of us, because we felt that when you do that, when you take away that money that was applied to the cost of irrigation, necessarily you place a greater burden on power revenue, and in order to get additional revenue you would have to increase the power rate. There is no doubt in my mind that that was the evidence, and that is a point on which every member of the committee will agree.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman understands that I am not opposing that part of the bill. The gentleman understands that I am talking primarily about the length of time—the 78 years.

Mr. CARROLL. But the point that the gentleman does not really understand—if I may be so bold—is the real purpose of this compromise. We extended the pay-out period so that we could give  $2\frac{1}{2}$  percent into the Treasury to pay the interest component into the Treasury. If we do not do that, then you will have to increase the power rate. The way that you do not increase the power rate is to extend the pay-out period 78 years, and I stand for correction if I am wrong on this to any member of the committee. Do I make myself clear on that?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I understand the gentleman but I do not neces-

sarily agree with him. But I will not take his time. A member of the committee, I think, will discuss it.

Mr. CARROLL. I am perfectly willing to answer questions.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think this has been worked out previously under the Department, and I think also the gentleman should understand, as I understand it, that the adoption of the amendment, which I hope will be offered, for 50 years, does not necessarily mean that no project will ever be built. It would pay itself out in longer time. I believe that projects of that kind must come to the Congress if we are to preserve the integrity of the Congress, and the financial integrity of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman four additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman from Montana has very ably pointed out that we are talking about a pay-out, an extension of pay-out period for revenue purposes. Now, if you limit that to 50 years necessarily you must find the revenue to take care of the project. In order to do that, your revenue must come from some source. It cannot come from irrigation, it can come only from the sale of power, which means increasing the power rate. That is what the gentleman from New Mexico has been trying to tell this body, that there are influences working underneath trying to increase the power rates. I should think everybody in California will understand, with your great Central Valley Authority, what the basic issues here are.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. At the present time and under the ruling of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, 3 percent is allocated to irrigation. The bill reduces that to one-half of 1 percent.

Mr. CARROLL. That is exactly right.

Mr. WELCH. May I call the attention of my colleague from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] to the fact that if under the amendment proposed the time is set back from 78 years to 50 years, it destroys the effectiveness of the bill, it emasculates it.

Mr. CARROLL. Not only does it do that but the experts have testified that it will destroy the economic feasibility of future projects.

Mr. WELCH. Projects cannot be amortized in 50 years.

Mr. CARROLL. I did not like this bill but I accepted the compromise because I thought that the Committee on Appropriations was holding a club over the West, and if we did not take this it might interfere with future projects.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I think the distinguished chairman of our committee made the point I have in mind, but is it not a fact that if the time specified in this bill is limited the whole effect of the bill is lost and we might as well send it

back to committee, because it destroys the compromise and the whole integrated program upon which this bill is based?

Mr. CARROLL. There is no question about that. If they cut the limitation in this bill I will fight it as hard as I fought it originally in committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. I want to serve notice right now that if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California to set back the amortization period from 78 to 50 years is adopted, as chairman of the committee I shall, with the approval of the committee, move to recommit the bill, because that destroys the effectiveness of the bill, and small irrigation multiple projects cannot be amortized.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I do not believe the testimony before the committee shows that changing this time raises or lowers the interest rate. I do not think that was the purpose of extending the time. The purpose of extending the time, as I recall the testimony, was to make other projects feasible, not to affect the rate that will be charged. In other words, under the reclamation law the irrigator is going to have to pay according to his ability. Whether we have this law or the old one, the man using the electricity is going to pay the same rate under this law as under the old one, but by adding the two together and extending the time we make projects feasible that were not otherwise feasible.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; I think the gentleman will agree with me that if we set a limitation of 50 years and change the interest component it necessarily means an increase in the power rate, because you have to have more revenue.

Mr. D'EWART. No; I do not think the evidence shows that.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sorry; I disagree with the gentleman. We discussed that for months. I take a different view.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2873 is a measure that will be of assistance to the West. I am for the development of our natural resources and, while this bill may not suit every individual, it is a good bill and I shall support it. As stated in the committee report, the bill is one which the Western States, the Federal Government, and the Nation as a whole can support wholeheartedly.

The extension of irrigation is a vital matter to many localities. From our national viewpoint it is a necessity. Our power development is needed also. There is a shortage of power in the country. The principle of public power has been well established. Believing that this bill will assist in these developments, I shall support it.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, the statement made by our esteemed chair-

man the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the very able chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL], and our very able colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] that the committee voted unanimously to send this bill out is true. However, I should like to give a little background of the history of this legislation, and also to point out the fact that this so-called compromise was effected during the last 12 or 24 hours the bill was before the committee. There was need for legislation. There is no argument about that. There is no argument over the fact that we need lower interests. I agree with them on that. I am for the power projects. I believe in helping irrigation in every way possible. This bill was before the Seventy-ninth Congress. It has been before this Congress and was one of the first bills that came up. We discussed it for weeks and weeks. Then, finally, we had a bill on which we voted in the subcommittee and on which there was disagreement. Then overnight the very capable attorneys from the Reclamation Division of the Department of the Interior came down and talked to some of the leaders in our committee and we have this compromise.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. You are absolutely mistaken. That compromise was made here on the floor between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], myself, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARNETT], and was then submitted after we had agreed with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] and he was satisfied with it. That is how the compromise was made.

Mr. POULSON. All right; I will stand corrected. But was not the compromise presented within the last few days after this bill had been before the committee an entire session?

Mr. LEMKE. There had been attempts at compromise made all along and one time I thought we had a compromise.

Mr. POULSON. But was not the bill passed out immediately after that? After this compromise was it not immediately passed out?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes. The committee was waiting for the subcommittee to agree and when the subcommittee was agreed it went through the committee, and you were present at that hearing and at other hearings.

Mr. POULSON. Did not some of the attorneys offer some of the wording of this legislation?

Mr. LEMKE. I will say that I called up the Department and asked them to figure out for me what would be a reasonable recompense in the extension of time so as to repay for agreeing to let the interest go into the Federal Treasury, that is, the 2 percent. That was the reason for the compromise and that is the reason for the extension of time.

Mr. POULSON. I cannot yield further, but I do want to say that after this bill was brought out, then the attorneys who represent the various groups in southern California, the largest municipally owned department of water and power, the Colorado River Board and the



Metropolitan Water District and all of these public agencies, saw in this legislation wording which they felt was definitely detrimental to the interests of southern California. For that reason and that reason alone, I found it necessary to oppose certain phases of this legislation. Why do I oppose it in certain particulars? As you all realize, this legislation definitely lowers the standards of feasibility for any project which would give the Director of Reclamation the power to authorize a project. We in southern California have one very serious problem confronting us. There is legislation in the Senate as well as in the House for a project for Arizona involving \$800,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 which absolutely has no semblance of feasibility. The minute we start lowering these standards of feasibility to such a low level that the Director or Commissioner of Reclamation can then determine that this is feasible, then we will have brought upon ourselves one of the most serious problems that could possibly confront southern California.

Whether or not they planned this bill according to the best legal advice we were able to get, if you will turn to page 9 of the bill, you will find it reads as follows:

Page 9, line 2: "(3) the return, without interest, within a reasonable period of years not exceeding the useful life of the irrigation features, and with respect to each irrigation block, in a period conforming so far as practicable to the period within which water users are required to repay their share of the irrigation costs, of that share of the investment found by the Secretary pursuant to subsection 9 (a) hereof to be properly allocable to irrigation but assigned for return from net power revenues."

Now, just last week the attorneys for the Reclamation Division of the Department of the Interior presented to the committee their versions of a bill which complements this bill, and which will absolutely lower the standards to such an extent that it will not be necessary for them to come before Congress to authorize any project. Let me read from this draft of a bill which their attorney presented when we had another piece of legislation up here, which definitely shows the fine hand of the Department, whereby they are going to attempt to take within themselves powers which we in Congress think we have today.

Quoting from this draft which was presented from Mr. Will, of the Reclamation Division, to Mr. Harris, page 2:

Each contract entered into under the provisions of this subsection shall provide for such rates as, in the Secretary's judgment, will produce revenues at least sufficient to cover an appropriate share of the annual operation and maintenance cost and an appropriate share of such fixed charges as the Secretary deems proper, due consideration being given to that part of the cost of construction of works connected with water supply and allocated to irrigation and to the recovery of the actual cost of such works in a reasonable period of years, consistent with the Secretary's findings regarding the financial capacity of the organization and within the useful life of the project.

We know that over in Egypt that project ran for about 2,000 years. They run for at least 200 years over in this country. Now, what are they attempting to do?

They are definitely attempting to take full control out of the hands of Congress, and then be able—I will not say they would do this, but this is what they could do: They could go out on about October 15, and they could say, "I, representing the President of the United States, am going to authorize a project in your district." That is exactly the type of power that we are giving them when we pass this bill, unless we make some amendments which I am going to offer tomorrow.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. My colleague from California is a member of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. POULSON. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. Why did not the gentleman offer the amendment before the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. POULSON. Because the bill went out so fast that I never had a chance to talk to the attorneys representing the publicly owned department of water power in Los Angeles; the Colorado River Board, the metropolitan water districts, and others. I am not an attorney. I do not understand these clever manipulations of words which can mean two or three different things, to be interpreted by attorneys again. My esteemed colleague can give me credit for not being able to understand that particular thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Poulson] has expired.

Mr. DEWART. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Did not the gentleman join with his colleagues on the committee in unanimously reporting this bill after the so-called opposition from the attorneys in southern California had made their opposition known?

Mr. POULSON. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, I represent the people of southern California, and if we find there is legislation which is definitely detrimental, and which has been placed there by attorneys on the last minute of the committee hearings, we certainly have the prerogative and the right to come out and oppose it. Does the gentleman say that a member of a committee, once voting for it, then finding there is something detrimental to his district, does not have the right to get up and oppose the bill? Does the gentleman say that?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WELCH. The purpose of this bill transcends the interest of southern California, northern California, Maine, Florida, or Louisiana. It is a national bill and not a sectional bill.

Mr. POULSON. All right. I ask the chairman if he is in favor of giving the power to any man regardless of political party to determine whether there shall be a project or not? Is he in favor of having Congress absolutely give up its power, abdicate? The Committee on

Public Works and the Committee on Public Lands absolutely abdicate their authority over these projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. Poulson] was very frank in stating his opposition to the present bill and also in indicating his intention to support certain amendments. His frankness leads him to say that he fears that the enactment of this bill would give encouragement or hope for a certain project in Arizona which he thinks might be harmful to southern California. I am very sorry the gentleman from California feels that way about it. I feel that it would be better for the gentleman from California to base his objections to any Arizona project on the merits or demerits of that project alone rather than to oppose a general reclamation bill which is intended to improve reclamation prospects in all of the 17 Western States.

This measure is indeed a general reclamation bill and applies under the given conditions to every one of the 17 reclamation States. It seems to me a part of wisdom to consider it on its own merit, as it affects all parts of the West—and I think beneficially—rather than raising objection to it because of the possible advantage which the gentleman from California thinks might accrue to the Central Arizona project on the passage of this bill.

Furthermore, perhaps the gentleman's fear that this bill, if it should become law, would help the central Arizona project to materialize is not well founded. No, if we pass this bill as it is it will have no effect whatsoever on the central Arizona project which the gentleman so positively opposes. No one thinks of the Secretary's finding of feasibility for a project like the central Arizona project. As the gentleman should know, the central Arizona project bill is now before the Public Lands Committee of the Senate in the form of an authorization. The proposal has been submitted to the States interested and it is my understanding that it would be impossible over the objection of any one State for the Secretary to make a finding of feasibility even if this bill were law.

I trust the gentleman from California will modify his objection to the Central Arizona project, but in any case his objection on that ground has no validity. Therefore, this objection might jeopardize the passage of this worthy measure for reasons that have no connection with the measure. If this bill is good for projects yet unborn in all the Western States—as I believe it is—it would indeed be a sad mistake to vote against it on the erroneous ground that to do so would

defeat a project one wanted to thwart. Such would be not only harmful but ineffectual.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time the committee substitute bill will be read as an original bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 9 (a) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 9. (a) No expenditures for the construction of any new project, new division of a project or new supplemental works on a project shall be made nor shall estimates be submitted therefor by the Secretary until after he has made an investigation thereof and has submitted to the President and to the Congress his report and findings on—

"(1) the engineering feasibility of the proposed construction;

"(2) the estimated cost of the proposed construction;

"(3) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be repaid by the water users;

"(4) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to irrigation and probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues and from sources other than the users of water for irrigation purposes to the end of providing the necessary measure of assistance in repayment of irrigation construction costs;

"(5) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to commercial power and which together with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate of not less than 2½ percent per annum can probably be returned to the United States in net power revenues;

"(6) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes and probably be returned to the United States;

"(7) the part of the estimated cost which can properly be allocated to (i) preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife pursuant to the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), or (ii) recreation, including recreation by reason of the provision of enlarged or improved facilities or conditions specifically and reasonably required for such purposes, or (iii) general salinity control, or (iv) silt control. Costs allocated pursuant to such findings, together with the annual operation and maintenance costs attributable to the same purposes, shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable;

"(8) the economic benefit-cost ratio of the proposed construction.

"If the proposed construction is found by the Secretary to have engineering feasibility and if the repayable and returnable allocations to irrigation, power, and municipal water supply or other miscellaneous purposes found by the Secretary to be proper pursuant to subdivisions (3), (4), (5), and (6) hereof, together with any allocation to flood control or navigation made under subsection (b) of this section, and together with any allocation made pursuant to subdivision (7) hereof, which shall be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable, equal the total estimated cost of construction as determined by the Secretary, then the new project, new division of a project, or supplemental works on a project, covered by his findings, shall be deemed authorized and may be undertaken by the Secretary. If all such allocations do not equal said total estimated cost, then said new project, new division, or new supplemental works may be undertaken by the Secretary only after provision therefor has been made by act of Congress enacted after the Secretary has submitted to the President and the Congress the report and findings in-

volved. The Secretary may make findings with respect to projects heretofore authorized as to that part of the cost thereof which should be allocated in accordance with the provisions of subdivision (7) hereof and in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and such part of said costs shall, after transmittal to the President and the Congress of a report containing such findings, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable. Operation and maintenance costs attributable to the purposes enumerated in subdivision (7) hereof shall, after the transmittal of any such report, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable."

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2873) to amend certain provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a letter to him from Mr. James Pearson, of Shenandoah, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### AMERICAN MARITIME LABOR AND THE EUROPEAN RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the recent war, many a torpedo was fired at an American merchant ship, and when it struck its mark quite a few jobs for American seamen went up in smoke and flame. However, never before has a torpedo been fired with such possible dire consequences as the one launched by the State Department's European recovery program. A German or a Japanese torpedo might sink one ship and deprive a few men of their jobs—the State Department's model ERP, 1948, will do just 500 times better than the best German or Japanese weapon and, most amazing to relate, the model ERP, 1948, torpedo was not designed or fabricated by technicians who know naval ordnance, seamanship, or shipping, but, rather, at the technical level by two Rhodes scholars, three professors, an investment banker, and a career bureaucrat. Nevertheless, I must confess, that it is an amazingly efficient weapon of destruction for the American merchant marine.

On January 13, I invited the attention of the House to the fact that acceptance of the European recovery program, as submitted to the Congress by the State Department, would sound the death knell of an adequate American merchant marine. The transfer of 500 vessels to foreign flags, as proposed in the ERP, would nullify the policy declaration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and would deplete seriously our national defense reserve of merchant vessels.

Today, I intend to discuss the personnel angle of this ERP proposal, for it

takes men as well as ships to make a merchant marine. A knowledge of the effect of the State Department's proposals on our American seamen and our American shipyard workers is essential to an intelligent understanding of this shipping problem.

The appropriation bill passed by the Congress last month contained \$1,300,000 for the reconversion unemployment program for seamen. This money was needed due to the exhaustion of a \$900,000 appropriation made last spring. The initial appropriation was used up, after only 5 months of the fiscal year had passed, due to the unexpected return of 372 chartered American vessels to the laid-up fleet between July and November 1947. The causes of this marked decline in the United States flag merchant fleet were the numerous transfers of American war-built vessels to foreign flags and the considerable number of new vessels from foreign shipyards—notably from those of Great Britain. The world's supply today of dry cargo vessels, in the 7,000 to 10,000 deadweight ton category, is far in excess of the world's demands. Nevertheless, such ships are being built in quantity in European yards, in large measure with steel obtained from the United States. We are following the seemingly absurd policy of delaying essential construction of passenger and other types of vessels in American yards because of the steel shortage here while, at the same time, we are shipping large quantities of steel to Europe for the construction of similar-type vessels in foreign yards.

Our merchant fleet is the marginal fleet of the world. Every ship transferred by us to a foreign flag, every vessel constructed in a foreign yard, results in one more idle American ship and in added unemployment for at least 42 American seamen. The long-run effect of the shipbuilding race being carried on by the western European nations is sure to be a serious overbuilding of the world's merchant fleet. Under such a condition the world's resources are wasted and it is America that suffers most of all, for the merchant shipping so vital to our national defense withers and dies on the vine.

I am not one inclined to be an alarmist, but there is no use in minimizing the dangerous and explosive situation now existing between the United States and the Soviet Union. I sincerely hope we may find peaceful solutions to all of our disagreements and differences, but we failed to do so in the past when Germany, Italy, and Japan were concerned, and we may fail to do so with startling rapidity in the future where Russia is concerned.

One of the absolute essentials for the waging of successful war overseas is a big merchant marine. We may talk about air power as we will. We may believe that air power will deliver the first blows; we may believe that it will deliver tremendously effective blows; we may believe that it is the paramount arm of the fighting services. I care not how many such assumptions we concede, the fact still remains that now, and within the next few years, at least, a big merchant



marine is necessary for the successful conduct of overseas warfare on a large scale.

We have that merchant marine. Russia does not have it and cannot build it in the near future. The one way she can get a big merchant marine quickly is to capture it through the sudden conquest of western European nations and the taking over of their ships. You may say, perhaps, that this is utterly fantastic. The overrunning of Poland, and France, and Holland, and Belgium, and Norway, and Denmark were fantastic; yet they were also real. You may say that if this should occur these ships would be brought to the United States by their foreign crews. Well, perhaps; and again, perhaps not. Dictators have ways of treating the families of those who go over to their enemies—ways which might well be quite effective in bringing about the delivery of most of these 500 ships to European ports.

In such event, a major part of these ships might well spell the added number needed for extensive overseas operations on the part of the Soviet Union—might well spell disaster for the American people. Who knows? And, not knowing, why take this unnecessary risk in a world such as we have today? We do not have any sugar daddy to look out for us if we get into trouble. The world considers us to be grown up and able to look out for ourselves. I hope the world is right.

The loss of 372 vessels from the active fleet, during the last 6 months of 1947, threw about 16,000 American seamen out of work. Neither the initial \$900,000 nor the supplemental \$1,300,000 appropriated for the unemployment program for seamen is a measure of the direct cost of seamen's unemployment. These Federal appropriations cover only unemployment for seamen who served on Government-owned vessels. Great numbers of seamen are entitled to unemployment benefits from State funds on the same basis as shoreside workers. As the States do not segregate their unemployment figures by occupations the full cost of unemployment among our merchant seamen is not easily ascertainable.

But, Mr. Speaker, the cost in the terms of human suffering is ascertainable. Just consider the problems faced by the families of American seamen. Supported by an occupation which allows at best only 9 or 10 months of earnings during the year, the families of seamen even now are faced with long periods of existence on \$18 to \$21 per week, from unemployment insurance. In the light of present-day living costs, such benefits do no more than meet food bills—and perhaps they cannot even buy sufficient food for a wife and children in a seaport city. In the event of the adoption of the ERP plan, the lot of the seaman's family will be even more difficult and discouraging.

The transfer of 500 American vessels means immediate loss of 30,330 jobs in the seagoing branch of the maritime industry—22,750 officers and seamen will be deprived of billets on board ship; 7,580 men ashore awaiting employment will be deprived of decent opportunities to serve at sea—all of this supposedly in the best interests of the American people. Because it has been traditional to rotate

employment in the maritime industry on a "first-in first-out basis," the effects of this surge of unemployment will be felt by every seaman. Time on the beach awaiting a ship, which now ranges from a week up to 5 or 6 weeks, varying according to rating and port, will be stretched to 8, 9, or 10 weeks in virtually every rating and every port.

And then the effects of this proposed ship transfer will be felt in ship-repair yards and in countless other industries which supply maritime needs.

Workers in private shipyards employed on new construction have fallen already from a wartime peak—from 1,700,000 to 33,000. The only employment now keeping minimum shipyard labor forces together, and preserving the core of the shipbuilding industry in this Nation, is the ship-repair work, which currently employs a little more than 70,000 men. With the transfer of 500 additional vessels to foreign flags—with repair work on these vessels being done in foreign yards—the bottom will drop out of American shipyard employment in some instances.

Employees of ship-chandling firms, of steamship offices, of maritime insurance companies, and other such shore-side industries will be hard hit.

Let us make no mistake about current conditions. Our maritime labor is no longer made up of an expanded wartime force. During the war we had over 240,000 merchant seamen afloat simultaneously out of a total maritime labor force of about 275,000 officers and men. Today we are down to far less than half that number. Experienced former seamen, recalled for the war, and many thousands of seamen trained for the war, have returned to shore-side pursuits. The present-day force is composed of skilled men who desire to go to sea as a permanent occupation.

We entered the war with approximately 55,000 active seamen. The lives and health of these men were endangered gravely by their lack in number for they were spread so thinly over our rapidly expanding merchant fleet that their physical endurance was taxed to the limit. After doing their own jobs, they willingly went on and did much of the work of green men recruited to get the ships to sea. Eighty thousand seven hundred and fifty-nine men are required to operate the very minimum merchant fleet which the President's Advisory Committee on Merchant Marine deems essential for the national defense. We have these men now—a distinct element in the security of America—but we shall not have them long if the proposed shipping provisions of ERP are approved by Congress.

The Paris report of the 16 western European nations contemplates a 1951 maritime labor force for the United States which, at best, equals only our prewar number. I do not believe that this Congress should accept the responsibility for such a dissipation of our skilled maritime manpower.

We have heard much of an alleged \$200,000,000 saving if we transfer 500 American vessels to foreign flags. Let me remind you of the appropriations for recruitment and training for maritime

labor during the recent war. For the fiscal year 1943, \$53,500,000; for the fiscal year 1944, \$63,225,360; for the fiscal year 1945, \$67,980,795; and for the fiscal year 1946, \$39,598,710. Thus a total of \$224,304,865 was expended on recruitment and training of maritime labor alone during those four war years, a figure in excess of the total alleged savings from the transfer of 500 vessels to foreign flags. This dollar total does not include the loss of vessels, the loss of life, the loss of cargoes, and the heavy accident and sickness tolls resulting from failure to maintain an adequate and skilled maritime labor force.

Then again, this figure does not include any part of the tremendous sums spent on the recruitment and training of shipyard labor.

Let us never forget that our seamen are Americans. They and their families spend most of their earnings for American products. Their taxes help finance this Government. If we add the cost of recruitment and training programs, the cost of unemployment benefits which will accrue, the losses in purchasing power and in tax payments from unemployment, and compare this sum with the alleged savings involved in the proposed transfer of vessels, I am sure that the alleged savings will look very seaisick indeed.

American seamen, as do American ships, provide other nations with dollars for exchange. American seamen spend dollars in foreign ports. American ships spend dollars for dock charges, harbor duties, food, and many other items in overseas ports. We should keep this definitely in mind.

Let us, as Americans, now consider the wage standards and working conditions which will prevail in these ships if they are transferred to foreign flags.

In June 1946, the twenty-eighth session of the International Labor Organization, the International Maritime Convention, convened in Seattle, Wash. The convention had before it a series of international agreements establishing a minimum world-wide labor code for the maritime industry.

The convention on wages, hours, and manning was by far the most important of these proposed agreements.

The United States had a then-established monthly wage for an AB—able-bodied seaman—of \$145 and, during the course of the convention, a new contract negotiated in the maritime industry, raised this minimum wage to \$172.50 and reduced the working hours at sea to 48 per week. Today, the American AB receives \$192 to \$197 per month, and there is an arbitration proceeding in progress which may raise this figure. Minimum standards proposed for adoption at the Seattle convention were modest indeed. A basic monthly wage of £18 or \$72 was suggested for able seamen with a maximum working week of 56 hours. The United States delegation sought a higher world-wide minimum wage and a shorter workweek. The European delegations, following the lead of the British, insisted upon a minimum of £16 or \$64 per month and the convention adopted this figure for a 56-hour working week.

Our delegation was disappointed in the results, but was pleased by the fact that the principle of an international wage-and-hour minimum had been established, and that some progress had been made toward raising the level of seamen in the most substandard foreign fleets.

Within recent weeks the British Government has announced that it will not ratify the Convention of Wages, Hours, and Manning. It was recognized at Seattle that the ratifications of the United States and Great Britain are essential for the convention to have any real meaning. As the British are now paying a wage in excess of \$64, their decision not to ratify is due apparently to their desire to avoid the maximum 56-hour week provisions of the convention. We are thus witnessing the very sorry spectacle of a labor government refusing to support a very minimum of labor standards. These are the wage standards and the working conditions to which we are being asked to transfer 500 American ships.

Mr. Speaker, does any Member of this House want to go on record as favoring a labor standard below a \$64 minimum monthly wage and a working week in excess of 56 hours?

American labor is unalterably opposed to the proposals of the State Department in regard to the transfer of vessels as proposed in ERP. I believe American labor deserves the support of every Member of Congress in its battle to maintain our merchant fleet.

The Master, Mates, and Pilots, the Seafarers International Union, and the Sailors Union of the Pacific have consistently opposed the gift of American ships and of seamen's jobs to foreign nations. In testimony before congressional committees, in their own publications, and in countless letters to the Congress, the representatives and members of these organizations have stressed the sad effects of such a policy on the American merchant marine.

The CIO is equally firm in opposition to the proposed transfers. Many of the Members of this House are familiar with the informative and constructive suggestions advanced by the CIO maritime committee for the shipbuilding industry of this Nation. The day before President Truman called upon the Congress to deliver this ERP left-hook to the jaw of the American merchant marine, CIO's president, Philip Murray, presented to President Truman a program for the maintenance of a strong United States merchant marine. Although the program was completely ignored in the President's message, I believe it is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress, whether or not he finds himself in complete agreement with Mr. Murray.

The opposition registered by all labor organizations to further transfer of vessels is not a policy originating among labor leaders. Rather, it is a policy dictated by the rank and file of labor—a policy expressed in resolutions and letters from the crews of hundreds of American-flag vessels operating on the high seas of the world. It is a policy formulated by the leaders of labor in response to the demands of the common man.

Seamen are prolific letter writers. The journals of the seamen's organizations, the Pilot of the National Maritime Union; the Voice, of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards; the Seafarers Log, of the Sailors Union of the Pacific; and many other such papers publish pages of letters from the membership of their respective organizations. A review of the letter columns of these publications shows that the most burning question today among American seamen is the proposed foreign-flag transfer of American vessels, and the threat of unemployment and want that such transfer holds for them and their families, for we should ever keep in mind that merchant officers and merchant seamen are married, just as you and I are married, and that they have homes and children, even as you and I have homes and children.

In recognition of the soundness of the position of the personnel of the American Merchant Fleet, in appreciation of their wartime services, in understanding of the contribution they have made and are continuing to make to the security and well-being of the Nation, the Congress should give heed to these voices coming to us from the sea and from the shipyards of America. There should be no further transfer of our vessels to foreign flags. Relief cargoes should be carried chiefly in American ships, for the well-being of all America.

#### REFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that certain bills which I shall enumerate, which have been inadvertently referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bills.

I may state that I have consulted with the Parliamentarian and am advised that these bills have been wrongly referred because the jurisdiction of the committees has been changed under the Reorganization Act. I have conferred with the author of each of the bills and also with the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and there is no objection.

The bills are as follows:

H. R. 790, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

H. R. 970, a bill to increase the compensation for total disability granted employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916.

H. R. 1872, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended.

H. R. 2047, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States.

H. R. 2048, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suf-

fering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended.

H. R. 3480, a bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation.

H. R. 3596, a bill to amend the act of December 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," to clarify the eligibility for benefits of certain employees detained by the enemy in the Philippine Islands.

H. R. 3673, a bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol, and for other purposes.

H. R. 3927, a bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing a speech of the Honorable Josephus Daniels, which on yesterday I sought permission to print, will be approximately \$177.50. I ask unanimous consent that this speech may be printed in the Appendix of the Record notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a speech recorded by him and broadcast over Station WWJ on Monday, January 19.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### EIGHT HUNDRED DOLLARS SALARY INCREASE FOR POSTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in 1945, postal employees received their first increase in pay in 20 years. This \$400 per annum upward revision represented a 20-percent increase, which was long overdue. It was entirely inadequate to keep pace with rising living costs and it did not anticipate the feverish jump in prices which has taken place in the past year and a half.

The gap between the fixed salaries of postal workers and the income needed to maintain a decent standard of living is widening. The strain is beginning to tell. Many postal workers are being forced to take outside jobs, on time that should be spent in rest or recreation, in an attempt to bridge the deficit. This is making serious inroads on their health, their peace of mind, and their efficiency. They cannot carry this double burden for long without cracking. It is our responsibility to prevent this by providing for an immediate pay increase for our loyal and hardworking postal employees,



In 1945 they received a 20-percent raise, but since 1941 the cost of living has zoomed over three times this figure. What about the difference? How is it compensated for? By dipping into savings which are disappearing. By going into debt.

We are preparing to appropriate billions for European recovery and billions for national defense, with small regard for the inevitable element of waste involved and yet we raise the cry of penny-pinching economy when the security of our own essential and constructive Government services is at stake. Small wonder that there is restlessness among our people to the indifference of Government to their needs.

To the specious argument that if our postal workers will only hang on and endure, everything will return to normal at some unspecified time in the distant future, I say: this is cruel and dangerous.

Prices will never go all the way back to prewar levels. If and as our economy goes forward, most of the pay increases won by our industrial workers will become permanent. The forgotten segments of our workers must try to catch up or find themselves losing ground before the higher minimum standard for living.

Could it be that Government workers are being ground into poverty because they cannot strike?

Workers in industry have been forced to strike on two occasions since the end of the war in order to win necessary wage increases. And a third round of strikes is coming up. But postal workers and all other Government workers are caught in an economic squeeze that will impoverish them unless financial help is soon forthcoming.

Here are the facts.

Wages in retail trade have gone up nearly 70 percent since 1939.

In manufacturing, they have increased over 100 percent in a like period.

In coal mining, they have increased 175 percent.

In the postal service, 20 percent.

Profits interestingly enough have more than doubled since 1939.

As against these incomes, the prices of all items have climbed 65 percent above the 1935-39 average.

Apparel prices have been boosted 90 percent.

Food has skyrocketed in price over 100 percent.

Where does this leave the postal worker and his skimpy 20 percent increase? In a truly desperate situation, for which we, the Congress, must assume the responsibility. It is in our power to correct this intolerable situation at once, by enacting into law the Butler bill—H. R. 4640—which provides for a \$800 yearly increase for postal workers. This, added to the \$400 increase granted in 1945, will total up to an increase of 60 percent since 1925.

Indifference may be excused on the grounds of ignorance but ingratitude has no case. I prefer to assume that we have taken our loyal and hard-working postal workers for granted, and that it is time for us to wake up and see that justice is

done in the matter of the pressing need for increased compensation.

Put yourselves in their position. How would you like to carry a heavy bag of mail all day long, or sort thousands of pieces of mail until one arm goes numb and you have to shift to the other for relief? Where is the incentive for working hard when a man finds that his pay is shrinking in its purchasing power? Is this the American method of rewarding conscientious service?

We, as Members of Congress, are doubly indebted to the men and women of the postal service. They do the work of delivering thousands of letters and pamphlets to our constituents at no cost to ourselves.

The postal service enables all the millions of people in this country to communicate with each other, and with friends and relatives all over the world. With each passing day, business and industry rely more heavily upon this dependable service.

What would happen if it broke down?

That is the measure of its importance and the reward which it should receive for serving us so well. Let business leaders and labor leaders speak up for their friends the carriers and clerks of the United States Post Office Department. Above all, let Congress appropriate sufficient funds to help them make both ends meet.

The President has called our attention to this problem of underpaid Government workers.

The next move is ours, and there is only one move. Give to the men and women who make Government function the increased pay which they deserve and need.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3342. An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations; and

H. J. Res. 232. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 21, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1222. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued FPC Reports, volume 5, which contains all opinions issued by the Commission during the period of January 1 to December 31, 1946, and in addition con-

tains selected orders in the nature of decisions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1223. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering its operations for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to June 30, 1947, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1224. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, covering operations for the fiscal year of 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1225. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to give the Secretary of Agriculture permanent authority to make payments to agricultural producers in order to effectuate the purposes specified in section 7 (a) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1226. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to extend the public-land laws of the United States to certain lands, consisting of islands, situated in the Red River in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1227. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to consolidate and revise the laws relating to the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1228. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the certified flying pay report, showing the average number of officers above the rank of major receiving flight pay during the period April 1 to October 1, 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1229. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the furnishing of services and the temporary detail of United States employees to public international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1230. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the Sixty-first Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4505. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation* and to authorize the disposition of certain replaced parts of such vessel as souvenirs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4836. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Omaha, Nebr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3506. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for a new Federal building in Huntington, W. Va., adjoining existing Federal buildings there, as an economy measure, before land values have increased as a result of improvements; with amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 4967. A bill to provide for

the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building and for remodeling of the existing main post-office building in Portland, Oreg., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3596) to amend the act of December 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes," to clarify the eligibility for benefits of certain employees detained by the enemy in the Philippine Islands; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 3480) to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 2048) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 2047) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 1872) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 970) to increase the compensation for total disability granted employees of the United States under the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 790) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 3673) to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to active-duty members of the Civil Air Patrol, and for other purposes; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A bill (H. R. 3927) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; Committee on the Judiciary discharged, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5029. A bill to provide for certain payments to States, Territories, and possessions, and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5030. A bill to provide for a Federal building at Kodiak, Alaska, for use as a jail and other Federal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 5031. A bill to restore the right of American citizens to freely own gold and gold coins; to return control over the public purse to the people; to restrain further deterioration of our currency; to enable holders of paper money to redeem it in gold coin on demand; to establish and maintain a domestic gold-coin standard; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 5032. A bill authorizing the modification and expansion of the flood-control project for the Clinton River, Mich., to include improvements for flood control and other purposes on Red Run, a tributary of the Clinton River, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 5033. A bill to amend section 7 (b) of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to advance the effective date of within-grade salary advancements; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 5034. A bill to amend sections 3 and 15 of the Immigration Act approved May 26, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 5035. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the eighty-second national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Grand Rapids, Mich., September 26 to 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5036. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Corps Band at the national assembly of the Marine Corps League, to be held at Milwaukee, Wis., September 22 to September 25, inclusive, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 5037. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise taxes articles sold to hospitals not organized for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5038. A bill to terminate the war excise tax rate on theater tickets and other types of amusement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 5039. A bill to increase the fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts and before United States Commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5040. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further ac-

crual of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 5041. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 5042. A bill to amend and extend the maximum-rent provisions of Public Law 129, Eightieth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 5043. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the eldest children of veterans of World War II where the veterans have received no educational benefits under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 5044. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5045. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act to protect the insurance against lapse by crediting to the insured dividends from the excess of premiums over death costs chargeable thereto and by automatic payment of premiums from the accumulated credits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 5046. A bill to grant an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5047. A bill to grant a cost-of-living increase in the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. R. 5048. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain mineral rights; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 5049. A bill to reopen the reverted Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 5050. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate and to increase and intensify research in the perfection of a vaccine for hoof-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5051. A bill to add section 3a to the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5052. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 5053. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5054. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Philadelphia National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 299. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution relating to the authority to allocate the use of grain for the production of distilled spirits or neutral



spirits for beverage purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1948, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. J. Res. 302. Joint resolution to effectuate the principles of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to effectuate the principles of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Con. Res. 131. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of January 19, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. Res. 436. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to make investigation on matters coming within jurisdiction of the committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 437. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4244; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 438. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3565; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 439. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4243; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 440. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3748; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 441. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3016; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 442. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1335; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 443. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4309; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 444. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4212; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 5055. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5056. A bill for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 5057. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth DeCourcy and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5058. A bill for the relief of Walter Wetteschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 5059. A bill to authorize Martin Travieso, chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, to accept a decoration from the French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 5060. A bill for the relief of John S. Steber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 5061. A bill for the relief of James B. DeHart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNGBLOOD:

H. R. 5062. A bill for the relief of Peter Kristian Kristensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1170. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Robert C. Reigert and 214 other veterans, students at the University of Cincinnati, in support of an increase in subsistence rates under Public Laws 346 and 16; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1171. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 75 residents of Butler County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1172. Also, petition of 16 residents of New Castle, Pa., in favor of S. 265, a bill to abolish liquor advertisements in magazines, radio programs, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1173. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 36 residents of Somerton, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1174. Also, petition of 225 residents of Steubenville, Ohio, and vicinity, circulated by the American Legion Auxiliary of Argonne Post, No. 33, in support of legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1175. By Mr. MILLER of Maryland: Petition of 54 residents of Snow Hill, Md., and 2 residents of Pocomoke City, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1176. Also, petition of 20 citizens of Crisfield, Md., in support of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1177. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Petition of citizens of Indiana County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1178. Also, petition of citizens of Armstrong County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1179. Also, petition of citizens of Cambria County, Pa., urging legislation establishing a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1180. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Roy C. Morgan, commander, New Milford Post, No. 217, American Legion, and 80 members of that post, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1181. Also, petition of F. C. Hazard, adjutant, Teaneck Post, No. 128, American Legion, Teaneck, N. J., and 61 members of that post, urging the establishment of a system of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1182. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mary Strobel and others, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to lower foreign postage rate; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1183. Also, petition of Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order of New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of H. R. 2848; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 21, 1948

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord most high and very near, to whose mind the past and the future meet in this very day, hear us as we pray.

The great questions that stand unanswered before us defy our best wisdom.

Though our ignorance is great, at least we know we do not know.

When we do not know what to say, keep us quiet.

When we do not know what to do, let us ask of Thee, that we may find out.

We dare to ask for light upon only one step at a time.

We would rather walk with Thee than jump by ourselves.

We ask this in the name of Jesus Christ, who promised to send us a guide into all truth. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

Washington, D. C., January 21, 1948.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

A. H. VANDENBERG,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. KNOWLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous request, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 19, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 84. An act for the relief of Mrs. Clinton R. Sharp;

S. 99. An act for the relief of John T. Hollandsworth, Jr.;

S. 136. An act for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes;

S. 166. An act for the relief of Anna M. Kinat (Mrs. John P. Taylor);

S. 167. An act for the relief of Mrs. Yoneko Nakazawa;

S. 185. An act for the relief of Thomas Abadia;

S. 186. An act for the relief of Santiago Naveran;

S. 187. An act for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis;

S. 189. An act for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra;

S. 190. An act for the relief of Pedro Ugalde;

S. 191. An act for the relief of Julian Uriarte;

S. 192. An act for the relief of Juan Llona;